



No. 9335. / 195

1-10



GIVEN BY

U.S. 857

Blue back *pts. 1-10*

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Part 1

Congress House

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 24, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



3701

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

(Circular stamp: FEB 25 1954)

Ent

Easton Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 8 - 1954

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, *Illinois, Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, *New York*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, *Pennsylvania*

DONALD L. JACKSON, *California*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, *Missouri*

KIT CLARDY, *Michigan*

CLYDE DOYLE, *California*

GORDON H. SCHERER, *Ohio*

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., *Tennessee*

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

THOMAS W. BEALE, SR., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

COURTNEY E. OWENS, *Acting Chief Investigator*

CONTENTS

February 24, 1953, testimony of Stanley B. Hancock.....	Page 4517
Index.....	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

Rule XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(g) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83^d CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Part 1

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1954

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:48 a. m., in room 225, Old House Office Building, Hon. Donald L. Jackson, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson (presiding), Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order.

For the purpose of taking the testimony this morning, the chairman has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Messrs. Doyle, Frazier, and Jackson as acting chairman.

Will you stand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear in the testimony that you are about to give before this subcommittee that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HANCOCK. I will.

Mr. JACKSON. You may sit down.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY B. HANCOCK

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name, please, sir?

Mr. HANCOCK. Stanley B. Hancock.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. You are advised that you are permitted to have counsel if you want counsel.

Mr. HANCOCK. I don't consider it necessary.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hancock?

Mr. HANCOCK. In Heber, Calif., in 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a résumé of your formal educational training?

Mr. HANCOCK. Entirely informal. I went to a year and a half of high school in San Diego, Calif., and about 8 months of business college in San Diego.

¹ Released by the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation or profession?

Mr. HANCOCK. My profession is that of circulation manager of the Long Island Daily Press in Jamaica, Long Island.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been so employed?

Mr. HANCOCK. Since December 1951; December 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had other newspaper experience besides that?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I have. I worked for the San Diego Sun, now defunct, beginning in about 1926, until, I think, 1932. I worked for the San Francisco—

If it has any significance, I worked for 2 or 3 months for the Western Worker in, I think, 1933, as circulation manager.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us start out by taking your record of employment beginning in 1926, regardless of whether it was with a paper or what.

Mr. HANCOCK. All right. About 3 months with the Western Worker in San Francisco, as circulation manager. My first position, as I have just mentioned, was that of district manager for the San Diego Sun. In 1928 to 1929—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a minute. What was the second paper you worked for?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I have to recover now.

I worked for the San Diego Sun from somewhere around 1925 or 1926 to about 1928.

I went to work for the Pasadena Star-News, as district circulation manager, for something over a year, into 1929; back to the San Diego Sun until about 1932, possibly 1933.

Some time in 1933 I was for perhaps 2 or 3 months circulation manager of the Western Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you engaged in that work?

Mr. HANCOCK. In San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

At that point did you leave San Diego and go immediately for employment with the Western Worker in San Francisco?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I did.

Under the term of employment, it is kind of hard to state. I was not formally employed—somewhere around 1935 or 1936 I was on some of these WPA projects, but it is very vague in my mind.

In September 1937 I became organizer for the CIO, UCAPAWA—UCAPAWA are the initials, United Cannery, Agriculture—I forget the full title.

Mr. BEALE. Allied Workers of America.

Mr. HANCOCK. Thank you, sir.

That lasted 3 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you engaged in that work?

Mr. HANCOCK. For a while in Bakersfield, Calif.; I think maybe a month and a half, perhaps 2 months there; the last month in San Francisco, and that work ceased. The allotment was withdrawn for that activity.

I became east bay manager for the People's World, which was an extension of the Western Worker, which had become at that time, or

about that time, a daily paper. This was the 2d of January 1938. I held that position for 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that position?

Mr. HANCOCK. East bay manager for the Daily People's World.

Mr. JACKSON. Would that be, substantially, Oakland?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; it was the Oakland territory. The office was in Oakland.

Six months later, or about July 1938, I became general circulation manager for the Daily People's World. I held that position until about April or May 1940, at which time I resigned, and had no employment, but about 3 weeks later I became circulation manager of the Santa Cruz Sentinel News, Santa Cruz, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. About what was the date?

Mr. HANCOCK. Some time around May 1940. I held that position until October 1942.

Around that time I was negotiating to try to get into the Air Corps; I passed some tests, failed in some others.

I left the Sentinel News preparatory to going into the merchant marine. I actually went into the merchant marine in January 1943, but for 2 or 3 months I worked; I had 2 jobs. One was—I can't remember the name of that; I was a machinist's helper. I don't know the name, some kind of a belt company.

Mr. TAVENNER. Link Belt Machine Co.?

Mr. HANCOCK. Link Belt Machine Co., yes, for a month or two—a month, I guess; then for another month or two I worked in ship maintenance and repair crews in San Francisco harbor, and in January 1943, went into the merchant marine.

In January 1946 I came out of the merchant marine.

In April or May 1946 I became circulation manager for the Lockport Union Sun and Journal.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what State?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is Lockport, N. Y.

Sometime around February 1948 I became public-relations director of the Erie Dispatch in Erie, Pa.

I lost that position in December 1949, as a direct result of my testimony before the Harry Bridges trial in San Francisco.

Mr. DOYLE. For whom?

Mr. HANCOCK. The last Harry Bridges trial in December of 1949.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean you were discharged because you testified in that trial?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, sir; under very sympathetic circumstances.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean you were fired sympathetically?

Mr. HANCOCK. Sympathetically.

Mr. JACKSON. That doesn't take much of the sting out of it.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think there was no other choice in the way the thing happened.

In January of 1950 I went to work for an old friend of mine, Harry Pollack, of San Francisco, who conducts a business of creating and carrying out special circulation campaigns around the country.

I never worked in San Francisco. My territory was the East, Midwest, and South.

I traveled for 1950, 1951, and until December 1951, when I became circulation manager of the Long Island Daily Press, my present position.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the management of the Long Island Daily Press aware of your appearance here today?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your employment with the San Diego Sun began in 1925 or 1926. How long did you remain in San Diego from the time of the beginning of that employment?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I was in Imperial Valley, which was my home, where I was born, for 6 months, and I remained in San Diego until some time in 1928; as previously stated, I went to work for the Pasadena News in the same capacity, circulation manager, and a year later was persuaded to return to the San Diego Sun, so I remained there until some time in 1933, when I think there would be some question as to whether I lost my job or I quit. It was a combination of not being too eager to keep the position and quitting my employer, and I had the rather difficult position of someone not too interested in their work.

By that time I was quite involved in Communist activity, so I remained in San Diego; in 1933 I went to San Francisco for this 2- or 3-month period, and came back to San Diego—are you interested in developing party activity?

Mr. TAVENNER. As soon as I get clearly in mind the period of time that you were in San Diego I want to ask you about your knowledge of Communist affairs in San Diego.

Mr. HANCOCK. Around 1934 I was in and out of San Diego. I was in Imperial Valley for a good part of that time. I was in San Diego most of 1935, 1936, and into September of 1937. I haven't lived in San Diego since.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you had knowledge of Communist Party activities while at San Diego. Were you a member of the party during any part of the time you were in San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, sir. From sometime in 1931—I can't be absolutely sure of these dates; it is a long time ago, but I believe it was sometime in 1931. It might even have been the latter part of 1930, I am not absolutely sure, until I left, and after I left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you withdraw from the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. When I left the Daily People's World in 1940. That was the final break. My party activity, as we understood party activity, practically ceased in 1937 when I went into the People's World activity, or rather in January of 1938.

While we held nominal party membership and attended meetings of the party, well, let's say, 99 percent of our activity was professional newspaper.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you questions a little later about the circumstances under which you left the party; but at this point, let us confine our questions to matters relating to your entrance into the party and your experience in the party.

Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a member of the party, the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I will do the best I can.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that I mean what were the influences that brought you into the Communist Party and who, specifically, was responsible for your recruitment into the party?

Mr. DOYLE. How old were you in 1930 or 1931 when you joined?

Mr. HANCOCK. My early twenties, 21 or 22; somewhere around there. I will do the best I can.

The family environment, family economic circumstance, without question, played a part. My father, for whom I have the greatest respect, now dead, was a Socialist. To the best of my knowledge, he was never a Communist, but he loved to talk and vote Socialist.

His brother was very much the same. They were Socialists. They went through stages where, at one time, the greatest man on earth to my father was Henry Ford, because he brought in the \$5-a-day pay scale for the first time in history.

They were great La Follette supporters, but they were, as far back as my memory goes, left of center and loved to consider themselves Socialists.

We, in my family, did not have a particularly religious background, but we were not antireligious; we were passive on the subject.

In this home environment as a child, I thought along the lines of underprivileged people. We, ourselves, were somewhat underprivileged. My father died penniless; my mother worked in laundries, and places like that.

My getting into the newspaper business resulted from never being able financially to stop carrying newspapers. I delivered newspapers as a kid; went to high school for a year and a half while I still delivered newspapers, and then couldn't go back to high school because we needed the income.

In California, in the early thirties, I truly believe the economic circumstances were much worse than they were throughout the country. All this impressed itself on my mind and made me subject to radical influences, which were plentiful at that time in the persons of my father and my uncle.

The actual way I got interested in the Communist Party was: I was working at the San Diego Sun as a district manager when my uncle brought around a fellow by the name of Meyer—Meyers—Levin, it sounds like, but not quite right—Meyer—he is a real old-timer; in fact, he disappeared from the California scene and located around New York somewhere, but he was a representative of the California Committee to Repeal the California Syndicalism Act. The Scripps-Howard newspapers, for whom I worked, were opposed to the California Syndicalism Act.

My uncle brought this person around and asked if I could introduce him to the editor, and maybe get a little publicity for him. I not only did that, but went to a couple of meetings as a raw, green kid, and was looked upon, I learned later, as a likely recruit for this chain belt into the Communist Party, which is exactly what the anti-CS committee was.

This Meyer Levin, if that is his correct name—I will get it in a moment—

Mr. TAVENNER. Could it have been Frank S. Meyers?

Mr. HANCOCK. No; it couldn't. His first name is Meyer, M-e-y-e-r.

So I was cultivated, and in the atmosphere where my paper supported the appearance of this group activity in town, I came in con-

tact with this person, and my uncle and this Meyer persuaded me that it was—without any particular difficulty—that it was a fine thing to do, and I accepted some position, I think publicity representative for this committee, and, in the course of contact with this Meyer person I, without any particular difficulty, was readily convinced that the Communist Party was the solution for all evils.

My father never agreed with me. He was a Socialist, but no more. But my uncle agreed with me and later also become a party member.

Those are really the circumstances. I suppose I should say that this is a skeleton outline of the circumstances.

The influences of the period were great poverty and I had become sensitive to such conditions and very sincerely wanted to do something about it, although it was a complex period. I felt that I sincerely wanted to do something about the appalling economic conditions. So, I would be willing to concede that it could be a small boy trying to be a big shot, I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you became a member of the Communist Party, did you immediately sign a card or an application for membership?

Mr. HANCOCK. To the best of my knowledge, yes, that would have been the procedure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall at this time the circumstances under which you signed the application, that is, to whom you made your application?

Mr. HANCOCK. I am almost certain that I made it to this Meyer Levin, L-e-v-i-n, and I will correct that if I can think of it. It doesn't sound quite right, but very nearly right.

At that time there was no Communist Party in San Diego; there had been, I was later informed, at an earlier period. Some years before the party, such as it was, had been broken up by the Trotskyite-Lovestone conflict. It was nonexistent; but there were a few party sympathizers or former party members around. It was broken up prior to my entrance into the organization by the process of somebody coming around and picking up all the books and never coming back with them.

So, there were a few people—a fellow by the name of Sol Bernhart, who was a local tailor; a local produce wholesaler, who was not a party member but very sympathetic, by the name of Saul Hillkowitz. Those were the earliest contacts.

Now, I can see 2 or 3 other people, but their names just aren't in my mind right now.

It was then a part of my earliest activity to pull these people together to try to form some kind of a unit, which we did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that unit have a name?

Mr. HANCOCK. I doubt it, unless it was called the San Diego unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons composed that unit after you perfected its organization or after its organization was perfected?

Mr. HANCOCK. As I recall, the creation of a unit would involve anywhere from 4 to 12 to 15 people; above 12 you would then split and form another unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of any additional persons who were members of this original unit?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, it is very hard for me to do that. I can't even say with certainty that Bernhart was a member of the original unit.

I have in mind this Meyer Levin introducing me to this group of people, and that is 1931, a long time ago. The best I could do would be to recall names in that general early period, but it would be unfair for me to say they were definitely attached to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before attempting to do that, let's trace the organization of the Communist Party a little more definitely in San Diego.

Did this original unit grow to the point where it was divided into additional units?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how many units there were in the Communist Party in San Diego by the time you left there, which I believe was in 1937 or 1938?

Mr. HANCOCK. 1937. Not exactly, but it is in my mind that the greatest growth we achieved would have been somewhere around 12 units, not necessarily at the time I left, but somewhere around 1934 or 1935 would have been the largest membership, which would have given us around 150 party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time occupy any position within the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I did.

The terminology changed; the activity was called one thing at one time and another thing at a later time.

In the early period we dealt with such expressions as "org. secretaries," "agit. props,"—the term "agit. prop." later became educational director. This was no doubt the Russian influence of abbreviating American words and combining them.

My first activity was that of organizer in the Communist Party. The position in those days of the leading person was called organizer.

Mr. DOYLE. Called what?

Mr. HANCOCK. Organizer; organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you fix the approximate period when you were the organizer for the Communist Party in San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I believe it is truthful to say that I was the leader of the Communist Party from the first date I have given you here until some time in 1936—the early part of 1937. The title changed, but I was in nominal leadership of the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other positions did you hold besides that of being the leader of the Communist Party? Did you have any official position in any particular group or cell of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I was, as the organizer of the party, in charge of the executive committee. It wasn't called the executive committee at that early period. The language escapes me, but it is a pyramid structure organization where you have units, and 2 or 3 members of each unit are drawn together in a central committee. We would at one time have called it a county central committee. I was chairman of the county central committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time did you occupy that position?

Mr. HANCOCK. I was in charge of the Communist Party until early 1937. I cannot honestly say what title existed. I perhaps could reconstruct right now.

There came a great change in 1934, 1935, the united-front approach, and all the party terminology changed at that time. The activity re-

mained the same; the terminology changed—well, some activity changed, too, but my activity as leader of the party remained constant until early 1937, some 6 months before I left.

This is another story, but I was negotiating at that point to relieve myself of party leadership, not activity—leadership.

A fellow by the name of Esco Richardson, E. L. Richardson, who, when I met him, lived in National City, a suburb, I suppose you could say, of San Diego, was appointed or elected chairman of the San Diego Communist Party. I perhaps held some executive committee position while I was there, but I had surrendered leadership of the party about 6 months before I left in September 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, while you were active in the party in San Diego, did you hold any State position with the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think so.

I must say that I have been asked these questions many times by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization when they were attempting to understand the entire picture.

I do believe that I was a member of the State committee, but I couldn't swear to it.

It is absolutely true that I attended meetings of the State committee, but being something of a dissident, I have in my memory—we remember the things that are most disappointing or most pleasing to us, and I remember when I was barred from membership in the State committee, considered a little to eccentric, from their point of view, when I was nominated but not passed by the party leadership.

It is very possible that there comes a later lull when I came into membership in the State committee. Certainly I attended the State committee meetings as county representative from San Diego.

Now, I do have to point out one thing that seems to be confusing to investigators.

As a result of a law in California, I presume in all States, there must be a legal State committee of a political party. That requires that names be filed in Sacramento, Calif. That was by no means the State committee. We selected nonentities from San Diego who could afford to have their names known as State committee members. They actually had to go to Sacramento to hold a convention, and this was the Communist Party. It was not the leadership. And there seems to be some confusion in the services about, "How is it that this was an official State committee?" It wasn't the State committee. It was the legal answer to the requirement that we have a legal State committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was a mere conformance with the law?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whereas the leadership of the party was constituted of other people.

Mr. HANCOCK. An entirely different group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the security feature to that the reason for that action?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; no doubt it was, although we didn't speak about it in those terms. It was quite obvious why the Communist Party would not announce the names of its real leaders or gather them together in any single place.

As I think about it, surely it was security; it had to be security.

Mr. JACKSON. Would it be possible to be appointed a member of the State committee of the Communist Party and have no personal knowledge of that fact, in your opinion?

Mr. HANCOCK. No.

Mr. JACKSON. I have reference to the testimony of Miss Lucille Ball in that connection, who was appointed a member of the State committee, and who in her affidavit stated that she had no knowledge or recollection of having been so appointed.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I can only speak from my relation to the people that I—

You are talking about this official State committee?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the one that held conventions, as all parties do.

Mr. HANCOCK. It could conceivably happen, but it would not have been a part of the strategy for it to happen.

The only way it could conceivably happen is if the party submitted the name of so-and-so, and failed to notify that party and didn't want that party at the State convention. Now, there is some legal requirement that if you nominate some person to the State convention you are supposed to be there, although I suppose sickness and what-not could explain why everybody doesn't get there—but we nominated people whose economic circumstances were such that they could have their name publicized, who could make a 2- or 3-day trip to Sacramento, and that is all, no further requirements.

Mr. JACKSON. Physical presence is not actually required. You can vote by proxy under the California State law.

Mr. HANCOCK. Then it is theoretically possible for a person to be nominated without knowing that.

Mr. DOYLE. Normally, though, if they were active in the party after that convention would they discover they had been named without their knowledge, as a member of the State committee?

Mr. HANCOCK. It would depend on the degree of their contact with the party.

Mr. DOYLE. I realize that, but I say, if they were active.

Mr. HANCOCK. When you use the word "active," I would say an active person would know that they were nominated to the State committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Hancock, will you explain as fully as you can the activity of the Communist Party during the period you were its leader in San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think I will have to ask you how extensive an answer you want.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, not knowing what you will testify to, it is impossible for me to say—

Mr. HANCOCK. You stop me, then—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And we will stop you in the course of your statement and ask you questions about things that we are particularly interested in. Things we are not interested in, we will give some indication to you.

Mr. DOYLE. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. On the record.

It would seem to me that that would center largely about its principal projects; I would like to know about them, what they were working on.

Mr. HANCOCK. In the earliest days the principal projects were something that happened before I came in, but I came in at the tail-end of the campaign, what they called the Red Flag Case.

Yetta Stromberg had run up a red flag and had been arrested in, I think, San Bernardino, Calif., and there was some "hoop-de-doo" in the courts about it, and there was a decision finding a flaw, stating that she couldn't be punished for it. That was a public campaign.

I would like to interpose right here the explanation that it is the nature, or was at that time the nature of the Communist Party to utilize all issues in or bordering on the civil liberties field to further the movement of liberals over to the radical side. As previously stated, the first group activity I came in contact with was an activity to repeal the California Syndicalism Act, which had brought about the incarceration of a number of people whose names escape me, but there were cases in court at that time, and there was quite a liberal field of thought that this was a little too stringent, that here were ample other laws to cover situations that the CS law was being applied to.

So, we have a Scripps-Howard newspaper, for example, opposing the California syndicalism law, and yet the only organized activity was conducted by the hard core of the Communist Party.

On a local scale, the principal activity was in the relief organizations, in the creation of—for example, the first outside organization I remember working on was what we called the Unemployed Council—not even good grammar, but that is what it was called, the Unemployed Council.

Here we set up many groups, organizations, throughout the city of San Diego—one in downtown San Diego, one in East San Diego, one in National City—and here our purpose was to try to be experts in the field of how to tell people how to get relief. At that time there were people in rather desperate circumstances.

Mr. DOYLE. Those were what years?

Mr. HANCOCK. This was 1931, 1932, along in there.

An important early activity of the Communist Party was the Committee to Free Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings.

As unemployment, as the depression worsened our activity among the unemployed became quite extensive. There were State conventions. We organized, or participated in the organization, of one and possibly two of what we called hunger marches. This is not the bonus march. That is a little vague in my mind. These were unemployed people getting in jalopies and driving up here to Washington.

I remember well a campaign to buy an old Willys-Knight and load it full of 8 or 10 people and start them out to collect money, and we sent wires, and sent them on, and so forth.

Mr. JACKSON. Sent them to Washington?

Mr. HANCOCK. Sent them to Washington; yes.

The main drive at that time was for some kind of an unemployment insurance bill. It had a name, and some Congressman from Minnesota was identified with it. He had introduced it in Congress, and

the Communist Party, with all its affiliates, was rallying support behind it, and the hunger march was to try to create pressure along that line.

Somewhere around, I think it is 1934, there was an international gathering in Moscow of the Comintern. Georgi Dimitroff had just been released by Hitler—or Hitler wasn't in power then, but he had just had this—this would have been later, then; the Reichstag trial was in 1936 or 1937.

Anyway, somewhere around 1934 or 1935 there was a vast change in the procedures of the Communist Party. It could be termed and was termed as the united-front approach. It was the immediate reduction of the use of revolutionary terminology, and the attempt to invade existing organizations, including the trade unions.

On the basis of achieving minor social or economic gains, I perhaps should say that this represented a very substantial change because up to that time the party would run people for office, but while they were running for office they were talking about "Defend the Chinese Soviets," even back in 1933, and all, "Support to Revolutionary Russia," and such nonsense as that.

So that that was subjugated, put in the background, and the main drive became the united-front appeal, which was to infiltrate organizations and bring them not into revolutionary status, but a more receptive atmosphere for a later revolutionary appeal, so that in somewhere around 1934, 1935, there was a greatly heightened penetration of the trade unions carried down to the lowest level, including our San Diego level.

We were more successful in San Diego than most places, but we only followed the policy that had been set up internationally, and we strove for leadership, tried to take charge of the activity, gain elected positions, that sort of thing.

The party, with a much watered-down public appeal, went extensively into electioneering. Under the united-front approach they endeavored to combine with, first of all, the Socialist Party; secondly, with the left or radical wing of labor; and would set up united-front committees that would in themselves project candidates for election.

This atmosphere prevailed until, as far as I can remember—it had its heyday of success, such as it was—that is, it reached its peak of success, which wasn't too much, around 1936.

In 1939, I think I am correct on these dates, September 1939, when Russia invaded Poland, there came another abrupt change, and I suppose due to necessity, since the united front was no longer possible, then the party drew into itself, maintaining its trade-union and other organizational contacts, and did everything possible to win support for its program at that time, which was "a plague on both your houses," the effect of which was to weaken support for England and France.

It was never presented that way, but when you say "You are both a bunch of rotters," the only possible support America would give would have been to the allied side, so when we say "They are both stinkers," the net effect is to reduce support for the allied side. That is the official position of the party at that time.

I have lost contact; I don't know how they have changed since.

Mr. DOYLE. When you said "A plague on both your houses," that was—

Mr. HANCOCK. 1939 was the Russian invasion of Poland—maybe no; maybe 1940. Hitler went in in 1939; I think Russia went in in 1940.

There was a time lag in there, but the fact that there are a large percentage, or were a large percentage of Jewish people in the Communist Party made them violently anti-Hitler, and it was a real revolution when they had to, in effect, become friendly with Hitler, and it was somewhere, perhaps 6 months or so—history books will show, anyway.

Mr. JACKSON. To what extent were you successful in bringing in to the support of these various movements, either through front organizations or otherwise, well-meaning citizens of the community?

Mr. HANCOCK. We thought we were highly successful.

Mr. JACKSON. In what particular areas did you—

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, of course, I am only aware of what happened in San Diego.

We did some work in Imperial Valley, but we had no such accomplishments in Imperial Valley.

I might say that I heard, aside from what I have been saying in San Diego, there was an atmosphere at that time where we heard more than just rumors; we heard that various prominent people were either identified with or were close to the Communist Party outside of San Diego. None of it is to my personal knowledge, but in San Diego we worked very closely with several people who might be termed community leaders, including the leaders of the San Diego Labor Council, including a couple of teachers, and there is a third one but I can't think of his name, a fellow who was an engineer—what might be termed at least a small segment of an intelligent group in San Diego.

Mr. JACKSON. To what extent were you successful at all in obtaining the use of ministers, the use of their names for the various activities?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think not at all. I don't recall any ministers.

Mr. JACKSON. Not at all in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it the purpose of the Communist Party in securing the cooperation and assistance of these various groups that you have spoken of to ultimately recruit into the Communist Party those who became close to the movement?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; it was, with the qualification that we would not want to recruit everybody. The purpose was to draw the entire group closer to us so that we could select the people that we wanted out of that group.

We didn't want the mass in the Communist Party; we wanted the leadership, and down into secondary and third leadership, but we didn't just want a person; we wanted somebody with some capacity for leadership.

The Communist Party was not a mass organization. Its essential structure was one that required everybody to have some leadership capacity, perhaps minute, but some leadership capacity.

Mr. TAVENNER. And by securing that leadership as members of the party, you could more nearly direct the activity of the group that he was otherwise identified with?

Mr. HANCOCK. Exactly. The purpose then was—when you speak about a hundred Communists, you speak about people who have real influence over a few thousand people.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, I assume that the purpose of recruiting leaders of various groups as members of the Communist Party was to increase the power of the Communist Party to project its own policies.

MR. HANCOCK. No question about that.

MR. TAVENNER. Can you describe more fully the efforts that were made by the Communist Party to infiltrate other organizations?

(At this point Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., left the hearing room.)

MR. TAVENNER. For instance, you began in your statement to tell us about the Unemployed Council.

MR. HANCOCK. Well, we created—no, we created the Unemployed Council. There later came into existence a similar group, the name of which escapes me. We infiltrated that group and took it over. The process was a rather simple one.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, in what field was this other group interested?

MR. HANCOCK. It was unemployment. It was a period when people grouped together to try to find some way to pay their rent or get relief. At that time there were all kinds of redtape restrictions on getting relief.

MR. TAVENNER. Was it the Workers' Alliance?

MR. HANCOCK. That name sounds like it; sure sounds like it. Yes, I—there was a Workers' Alliance at that time, and it was a rapidly changing period, and I think that that is the group that I now have in mind, the Workers' Alliance.

MR. TAVENNER. Can you be specific as to how your work was done in infiltrating that and other organizations?

MR. HANCOCK. Yes—if you will just allow me this margin, that I may be describing what happened in some other organization, but it is the same tactic.

The tactic is, we learn of or we see the existence of an organization in which we would like to have influence or control. We put a few people into it as members. They cultivate other existing members.

Prior to the time this group is going to have a meeting, we have what we call a fraction meeting. We discuss the issues that are coming up at that meeting. We discuss how we may gain influence or leadership by what we will say. We discuss how to prevent something from being done that we disagree with. This might be done by wearing out, by a succession of speakers getting up and wearing out the patience of the group.

But our major purpose is to, first of all, go in there with our own members; secondly, to recruit other members into a committee that thinks along the same lines, and sooner or later to draw these people back into the Communist Party and then to conduct ourselves on the floor of these meetings in a way that will give us leadership, elected to—for example, they are going to send a committee down to the city to protest about something. We will volunteer to be on that committee. Since we are the vocal means, most likely one of our committee will be elected chairman of the committee, and we will come back and talk about all we accomplished, and the first thing you know we are in charge of the organization.

I think it is important to understand that we gained leadership by doing something. We were very active. Most people are inclined to be hesitant, timid, don't want to take charge, and so forth. We were very bold—very stupid, I might say, very stupid, too.

Mr. JACKSON. You came before your own people with a determined course of action, voluntarily while you were there, and you stayed until the last?

Mr. HANCOCK. We were quite willing to do the dirty work, and people said "let them do it."

Mr. JACKSON. That is the weakness of so many organizations that have been infiltrated in that area.

Mr. HANCOCK. No question, it is a powerful approach, highly successful, but I think not as successful today because I think it is pretty well known that this is a Communist tactic. In those days it was not known.

Mr. JACKSON. The Waldorf peace conference¹ was very successful.

Mr. HANCOCK. The what?

Mr. JACKSON. The peace conference at the Waldorf.

Mr. HANCOCK. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. JACKSON. And certainly they are experiencing that today in bringing in a lot of substantial names to the Committee for Amnesty to the Smith Act Victims.

That committee is flourishing; it is flourishing out in Los Angeles. The Communists have obtained the use of the names of a number of substantial community leaders. Anyone who can look past the false facade of the organization must know that it is Communist dominated and directed.

Go ahead, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say that one of your greatest allies in your successful infiltration of various organizations was complacency on the part of the membership of that organization, that is, an attitude not to vote in their meetings or not to take active parts in the organizations of which they were members?

Mr. HANCOCK. No doubt that element existed.

I would say that our greatest ally was the economic circumstance of the period. The fact that we were in motion and other people were motionless. The secondary ally was the normal, human bewilderment of how to cope with committees and stand on your feet when your legs are shaking and people are looking at you, and the average guy, he might think that is a wonderful thing to be a leader, but he doesn't quite have the courage to get up and do these things, and when someone else is very vociferous and holds out the verbal promise that "follow my leadership and everything will be wonderful"—here you have what might be termed an element of complacency.

No. 1, though, was the economy of the period. If we hadn't been in such economic straits nothing as peculiar as the Communist appeal could have taken place.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't want to go too far astray here, but I think you are making a very valuable contribution to the committee in your testimony on the effective work done by Communist minorities in organizations, and I should like to explore a little further the economic aspect of communism.

Communism undoubtedly holds an appeal to the underprivileged, those who are hungry, but how do you account, out of your own ex-

¹ The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 25-27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

perience, for the noneconomic Communists, the Alger Hisses, the people in the motion-picture industry who were making two or three thousand dollars a week when they joined the Communist Party? To what do you attribute their association with the party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think there is no all-encompassing answer. You ask a question that would have to be answered in a dozen different ways. I would just like to approach it in the following way: I will talk about the movie actors.

We have a phenomenon of modern-day life where people are recompensed far beyond their possible talents——

Mr. DOYLE. Far beyond what?

Mr. HANCOCK. Their talents. A person suddenly makes a million dollars. They live then with great inner fears of insufficiency. They have guilt complexes; they try to assuage these complexes by saying, Well, I will do something for somebody else."

That would be a very partial approach to the movie actor problem.

The intellectual is something of a different problem. He also has guilt complexes. He also has traces of desire for leadership. He sees a ripe field for leadership. As he moves over to the left he becomes in his own mind a Messiah to the downtrodden. And some of the people that I have been in touch with seem to be that type, that they fully relish the leadership role and the poor people looking up to them.

I think in the troubled mind of the intellectual there is sometimes an incapacity to balance the problems of modern-day living. As a person—they say "sometimes a lot of knowledge is worse than a little," and some of the intellectuals get themselves far afield to the point that they believe that the capitalist society as we know it cannot continue, that it historically will disappear, and that they, therefore, believe that it is intelligent to ally themselves with what seems to them to be the new society.

You see, it is a part of Communist philosophy, we learned—my education was not very much, but I went through the same study activity of all Communists.

We are taught this, for example, if I may digress for just a moment, that history shows a succession of civilizations, savagery itself being one of the earliest forms, barbarism being a horrible thing in our modern-day lights, but a vast improvement over the social structure of savagery. Feudalism was a step forward, but by our modern-day lights would not be good; however, it was a way of life. And after feudalism came capitalism, which was a great step forward, but by modern or future lights a terrible condition. Then after capitalism will come this glowingly wonderful state of communism.

You can't pursue it much further because logic won't take you much further.

You learn that up to this point one of the essentials of life is conflict; yet, when they are selling you communism they tell you all conflict ceases. It is a contradiction, but they wrestle with it, and they believe it, up to a certain point. I could surely say I believed it. I wasn't equipped to believe anything else. I believed it. I don't believe it now.

I think that intelligent people, intellectuals, wealthy people, have in some measure guilt complexes combined with messiah impulses, and that brings them into this activity.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us instances in which the Communist Party was successful in infiltrating groups in the San Diego area?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Infiltrating, let me add, to the extent that it became the dominating influence in the group, because I assume they infiltrated everything, sometimes successfully, and sometimes not. I think what we are trying to determine is the point at which they did succeed in actually taking over the physical direction.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, actually, the field is quite limited.

At that time this considerable turmoil over unemployment brought organizations into existence, and it would be true to say that they all came under the domination of the Communist Party. They had no great significance or any great lasting quality.

The most significant activity of that period that I am familiar with was the infiltration of the American Federation of Labor, which is a rather remarkable story in that it was done with a half a dozen men, and at one point it consisted of capturing the control of the Central Labor Council.

Mr. JACKSON. When would that have been?

Mr. HANCOCK. I am quite sure it was 1935 and 1936, or one of the two. There was a—it could be tied down because there was a State federation of labor meeting in San Diego which was, it seems to me, in the early part of 1936, in that area, 1935 or 1936.

Mr. JACKSON. And by saying that they achieved complete domination, you mean to say that the policies of the Communist Party were actually effected in the Central Labor Council during that period?

Mr. HANCOCK. By and large. Sometimes you have a recalcitrant membership, but by and large, we were successful in getting the things across that we wanted.

Mr. JACKSON. From a practical standpoint and in most organizations the recommendations of the board of directors or those who are in charge of the development of a program are generally accepted by the membership. I don't know how many times I have listened to nominating committees' reports, and very seldom does the convention go off on a tangent and introduce another slate. It has been done, but I gather when you say that the Communists achieved domination, that was political domination of the council at that time?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is right. So you could say 80 percent of what the Communists wanted done was accomplished, and the Communists didn't want some things done because they knew it wasn't possible, but 80 percent of what the Communists wanted came into being in the form of resolutions, and so forth.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you say that, conversely, 80 percent of the things they didn't want done were not done?

Mr. HANCOCK. I would say so.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am informed that there was a convention in San Diego in 1935 of the California State Federation of Labor.

Mr. HANCOCK. Then it was—

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the event you are referring to?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; that is the one I tie my memory to, because we build up to a certain point there and I can recall this thing I am talking about in relation to that convention.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you give us the full history of that, both what led up to it and what occurred at the time of the convention?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. Somewhere, perhaps a year earlier, my uncle, Henry Hancock—

Mr. DOYLE. What is his name?

Mr. HANCOCK. Henry; Henry Hancock.

Mr. DOYLE. Henry Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK. Who was a member of the carpenters' union, spoke to me about A. C. Rogers, secretary of the Central Labor Council, who seemed to be quite radical in his expressed belief. His original organization was the office workers, which is to say that he was not a union man, or at least he didn't come from a basic group, but his qualities were such that he had been elected secretary of the Central Labor Council, which was the dominant position.

We had at that time, perhaps, 1 or 2 or 3 delegates to the Central Labor Council who observed the actions there. I say "we had"—the Communist Party had members who were delegates from their own organization to the Central Labor Council, so that his name came to our attention, A. C. Rogers, in a—

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you there.

Who were the delegates?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, my uncle would have been one of them, and I am really vague on the others.

There is a fellow by the name of Jones, also a carpenter, from the East San Diego branch of the carpenters' union, who was a delegate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; and a member of the carpenters' union, and, as such, elected a delegate to the Central Labor Council.

At various times my difficulty—the name is Claude Jones—my problem is pinning down names and activity to a certain period. I cannot with accuracy tell you that these people were the delegates at the time I am talking about, which is at the beginning.

Mr. JACKSON. That will be understood.

Mr. HANCOCK. I hope you will understand.

Mr. JACKSON. To the best of your recollection; and in discussing any names of any individuals, of course, would you please indicate whether they were or were not members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Now, somewhere along the line—anyway, this was the original, just 2 or 3—my recollection is that some time around early 1935, anyway, I went to see A. C. Rogers. He knew who I was. I persuaded him to join the Communist Party. It is in my recollection I walked out of there with a signed card. It is very hard to recall 20 years ago, but it is in my recollection that that is what happened.

Mr. DOYLE. What were you then in connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I was the leader of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. And he knew that?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; he knew it. When I walked in the door he knew it, and when I walked out he knew it for damned sure, because I had his application.

Mr. JACKSON. You were an open member of the Communist Party, generally known throughout San Diego to be the organizer or head of the party in that area?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. And in all of your contacts throughout the city generally, that fact was known?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I was an open party member.

The recruitment of A. C. Rogers was a considerable step forward for us because it gave us advance knowledge of what was to come before the meetings, and through his offices we were able to plan our strategy, but I think I might develop this a little further.

Somewhere in the coming year and prior to the State federation convention, we had succeeded in creating a group, and it is in my mind that quite possibly all of them were party members.

I have searched my mind to find the specific instance when they became such, and I am unable to do so, but I want to give you the names; I think I have already given them here, but in the event I haven't—

One was a Daisy Lee Worcester, who was a delegate from the teachers union. She ran a private school, a very intelligent woman, and before we came in contact with her, was pretty much of a radical. She was at least completely under our domination for approximately a year. I think she was a party member.

I also think Harry L. Steinmetz was, but I cannot find in my mind when it happened, and so forth, but I have to tell you what I know, anyway.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the Steinmetz from San Diego State College?

Mr. HANCOCK. He was at that time.

I met with these people. I will give you the rest of the names.

David Wosk, W-o-s-k, who was an engineer; I don't even know what kind of an engineer, but some kind of an engineer; he had an office.

There was some broker; I gave you his name, Mark somebody—Mark somebody—Mark Fisher, who was a broker.

There was another teacher whose name escapes me, but who occupied a relatively unimportant role in this activity.

Meeting with the group was Paul Alexander, who was my right-hand man in the Communist Party, and myself.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to get this clear in the record.

You say you met with these people on various occasions?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. For the purpose of discussing Communist Party operations?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I think you would have to say it that way.

Mr. JACKSON. That is, it was not—

Mr. HANCOCK. I didn't say it that way, but I think it was even accepted that way.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't want to put any words in your mouth, but I do want to get it very clear that in your discussions with these people, you were known to them as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

I am going to give you another name before it gets away from me: Johnnie Leyden, L-e-y-d-e-n.¹

¹ This individual later identified by witness as John Lydick.

I think that is about the sum total of the group.

Now, in the next several months in meeting with this group, of whom most, if not all, were eventually party members, we took over control of the Central Labor Council. I think it is no exaggeration to say that we maneuvered the election of Harry Steinmetz as president of the Central Labor Council. A. C. Rogers was already secretary, and we had him reelected, or, at least, it was our wish, and it came out that way, that he be reelected.

We had several more delegates in the council by then; this being the heyday of union organization, we put this fellow Sol Bernhart in as a delegate from the tailors union, if I remember correctly, and we had a fellow from the electrical union; I can't think of his name. He wasn't too important anyway, but I suppose we had 8 or 10 delegates on the floor, so that when an issue came up, this being a group of 60 to 100 men, with the president and secretary following the line, and a number on the floor, it was sufficient to bring about the things that we wanted, except for certain problems, like we wanted to take over the San Diego Labor Leader, which was the weekly voice of the labor movement.

There was another fellow by the name of Rogers, who was an old-time editor of that paper, an old-time radical, but a violent opponent of communism. He was in his declining days, and one of our big fights was to take over that paper.

The opposition, headed by a fellow by the name of Dowell, from the projectionists' union, motion picture projectionists union, Stanley Gue, the labor commissioner, and this old fellow Rogers, were the rallying center for the opposition, and somewhere along the line Rogers, the editor, got sick—and now comes the name that you asked me about, Brick Garrigues—we maneuvered his appointment as editor of the San Diego Labor Leader.

MR. JACKSON. By "we" you mean the Communist Party?

MR. HANCOCK. The Communist Party, yes. And I should say that by "we," so as to give you a complete picture of this, I don't mean that this group I have just named originated—Paul L. Alexander and I and the San Diego Central Committee, in consultation with the San Francisco Central Committee, as it was called—

MR. TAVENNER. Of the Communist Party?

MR. HANCOCK. Of the Communist Party—would work out the overall strategy. We would then decide how and when we would present it to this group, which contained a number of party members, and on the basis of that we would take it on to the floor of the Central Labor Council.

Anyway, we took over the editorship of the San Diego Labor Leader, and I am not clear about Brick Garrigues. He was working on the San Diego Sun. I don't know how his name came to us, but he fitted into the group and, to the best of my recollection, was a party member. We recruited him as a party member.

So I remember driving over to Coronado in the greatest secrecy one night to meet him and discuss whether or not he was prepared to give up his job on the San Diego Sun and take over the Labor Leader. He was, and it was accomplished.

There was a gathering storm. Dowell, Gue, and Rogers, being in touch with the main office of the American Federation of Labor, had said, what I must say was quite truthful, that the Communists were taking over the labor council.

There came a day when they sent somebody in, Kelly somebody, to remove the charter; on order from Bill Green he just came in and yanked the charter of the central labor committee. That started our decline.

I must say it was a very sagacious move. We went to court and did one thing or another, but they took over again.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that, 1935, 1936?

Mr. HANCOCK. 1935 or 1936.

We held some rump sessions, but these people that we were leading began to realize that the full strength of the American Federation of Labor was alined against us, and so we were unable to hold our control and they set up an entirely new central labor council, would not admit our known members or suspected members, and, to the best of my knowledge, we drifted away from control, but that control brought about the following:

First of all, it gave us domination of the San Diego delegation to the State federation of labor convention in San Diego. The record will show that for the first and the last time San Diego voting strength went to Harry Bridges and the line that he pursued, being very intricate and involved, but Harry Bridges was the rallying point for the left of center group, and Vandeleur was the rightist, but we made a bid for power, stronger than ever, but not strong enough to take over the State federation of labor.

Mr. JACKSON. I assume Bridges was known to you to be a member of the Communist Party. You said you testified at his trial?

Mr. HANCOCK. I was so informed. I was not a participant in any of the activity that brought him into the party.

Mr. JACKSON. You never met in a party meeting?

Mr. HANCOCK. In a party meeting? No. As a matter of fact, the thing I testified on at the Bridges trial was a fraction meeting.

Our definition of a fraction meeting is that it is party members drawn from various organizations. Now, it is possible for a nonparty member to be present at a fraction meeting, but at this particular meeting the people that I recalled who were there were party members, and I so testified.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a meeting attended by Harry Bridges?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; and that was in relation to this State federation convention. It was primarily as to the State federation meeting. For example, A. C. Rogers either was at that meeting or we brought him into contact with Harry Bridges to lay out our plans for the floor fight at the federation.

Mr. JACKSON. Had Rogers' membership in the party become generally known by that time or at that time?

Mr. HANCOCK. No; it had not. In fact, it was never known. It would have destroyed his capacity as a known member of the party.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have any knowledge as to his present whereabouts?

Mr. HANCOCK. No. You see, he was sacrificed in this struggle. I heard he went to Arizona; that is the last I heard.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. On the record.

Mr. HANCOCK. And I would just like to say this: I think he is a hell of a nice guy, Rogers. So many people of that period just wanted

desperately to do something. I honestly believe that he did not have an evil thought in his mind.

Mr. DOYLE. An evil thought?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. I think that everything that he did was motivated by a desire to do good. Of course, we are all motivated by a desire to improve our own position, but I believe Rogers is a very fine fellow, and I believe you will think so if you come in contact with him.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know if he later broke with the party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; but it is not firsthand; it is second or third-hand. He just drifted away—wouldn't come to any more meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have mentioned the name of Garrigues. Is that Charles H. Garrigues?

Mr. HANCOCK. It is C. H., parentheses "Brick" Garrigues, and I can't remember his first name; it probably is Charles.

Mr. TAVENNER. He has testified in executive session before this committee and stated that he was recruited into the Communist Party by you, so if there is any uncertainty in your mind as to his being an actual member he has admitted his membership.

Mr. HANCOCK. No; I have the feeling that he was a member. I remember driving to Coronado to talk to him as a party member in the matter of his becoming a labor leader, but I just don't have the picture of how and when I recruited him.

I am reasonably sure he was a party member. Now you say he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the names of a number of other people, and it is not quite clear in my mind whether you identified them definitely as members of the party or not, and I want to see what you say about that.

You mentioned the name of Mark Fisher. Was he known to you to be a member of the party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, Mark Fisher was one of this intellectual group that we met with. I think it is quite possible that everyone of those groups were actually members of the party. My problem is to try to say or recollect in my mind the actual physical action of them becoming members of the party.

We considered them fully in support of our program. With the peculiar arts that all individuals have, we considered them as extensions of the Communist strength in whatever activity we had been in.

I, for example, don't remember recruiting Mark Fisher. Maybe somebody else did. I just don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. But, at any rate, he engaged in Communist Party activities with full understanding of the nature of those activities?

Mr. HANCOCK. No question about that.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this right there:

I notice this man Rogers, you said everything he did was with a desire to do good.

Now, was he the revolutionary type of Communist that you testified to prior to the time the line changed?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir, he wasn't. His connection with the Communist Party was confined entirely to his trade-union activity. He participated in no party activity except accepting from us directions on what to do in his trade-union. At that period the directions we gave had some semblance of reasonableness to them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the name of John Leyden.

Mr. HADDOCK. Lidick, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say Leyden.

Mr. HANCOCK. I will correct that now. It is Lidick, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I am quite sure I recruited him.

Incidentally, he, at a later time, identified himself with the revolutionary forces and fought us quite vigorously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which would indicate he withdrew from the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Somewhere about half-way along he did a reversal, so that he was fully identified with the group that was fighting us. At an earlier period he was one of our delegates. We recruited him through A. C. Rogers. He was in the plasterers union, and he was one of our floor delegates.

At the time that we had the president and the secretary, Lidick went over to the other side and fought us most vigorously, and later became secretary of the Central Labor Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned a person by the name of Wosk, W-o-s-k.

Mr. HANCOCK. L. David Wosk.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. He was in this group.

I have to repeat—I think so; I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it true from the descriptions you have given that he was a person who carried out the directions of the Communist Party and participated in Communist Party activities with knowledge of the character of those activities, that is, with knowledge that he was performing the will of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Whenever you reach a point which is convenient as a breaking point, I think perhaps we could all stand some lunch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to have just a few minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to Daisy Lee Worcester as a member of the Communist Party. I think you identified her definitely as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I simply have a stronger feeling that she was a member. I think they all were, but I can't pin it down.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, can we put it on this basis, that all of these people of whom Mr. Tavenner is inquiring now and whom you have named as those who did the work of the Communist Party in one way or another, these are all individuals with whom you have conferred on Communist Party problems, and I assume there were no non-Communists or anti-Communists present at the time you had these discussions—

Mr. HANCOCK. There were no anti-Communists. There could have been non-Communists.

Mr. JACKSON. There could have been non-Communists present?

Mr. HANCOCK. And with that qualification, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. JACKSON. And again, I am certainly not trying to direct your answer, but I am trying to pin this point down because it is an extremely important point.

Mr. DOYLE. Right in there, may I add this to identify my own thinking.

I remember, I think you said in 1934 or 1935 there was a radical change from the revolutionary line; that there was an unemployed condition around, people on relief, and then the Communist Party later changed to emphasize minor social changes.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, does that mean that you active Communists and leaders stopped emphasizing the revolutionary line in fact, I mean you top leaders?

Do you get the difference? In other words, when later on?

If I may, I want to ask more in detail on that, but I would be interested to know when these Communist leaders in our State, Mr. Chairman—because you and I both live in California—stopped, at least for a time, advocating the revolutionary line, which I am thinking of as the policy of advocating that sooner or later there would come a revolution, if need be, by force.

Is that what I understand the revolutionary line to be that you are talking about?

Mr. HANCOCK. In essence, that is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I mean did you top leaders in '34, '35, when you said—I understood you to say that you abandoned the revolutionary line temporarily and began emphasizing minor social changes.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think it would be more accurate to say that we violently shifted our emphasis. The hard core revolutionist always believed at all times that the end would have to be a revolution. The—

Mr. DOYLE. Now, right at that point, what kind of a revolution? I mean, how would that revolution come about?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, you have a point of interest here, because it is a part of my personal history that I got involved in a rather serious dispute with the party around that issue, to the extent that somebody from New York State came out here ready to throw me out of the party, and that was the beginning of my decline.

But to get back to this point, there was a controversy among the party leaders as to whether it was correct to say that it would be impossible to have communism without a bloody revolution. There was an important trend of thought that in this existing period it can be voted into existence.

I must say, to my eternal shame, that at that time my position was that, as a student of communism, that was not true; that the revolution would have to be a violent one.

Mr. DOYLE. And up until what year did you believe that?

Mr. HANCOCK. I believe it now—if you understand what I mean. I believe that if the Communists came into control they will come into control through a violent revolution.

Mr. JACKSON. That is basic doctrine, isn't it, in all of the writings, from Marx on through Lenin and the rest?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; it is.

Mr. JACKSON. It is a theory of violent revolution; it is stated in so many words on many occasions.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, it is; but it was tempered in that united-front period where important sections of leadership temporized with the idea of what was happening in France, pointing possibly to a way of peaceful coming into power.

Mr. JACKSON. That was the period immediately preceding the Duclos letter, wasn't it?

Mr. DOYLE. That was in April of 1945.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it a period of coexistence between communism and capitalism?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, we thought of such things in terms of relationship to the existence of Soviet Russia, maintaining its status indefinitely in the face of capitalist powers. We never thought of the existence of the Communist Party as something that would just go on and on forever in relation to existing hostile anti-Communist organizations.

I think it would be correct to say that in that period there was considerable discussion on the possibility of bringing communism into effect by peaceful means, and I think it would also be true to say that these people that I have just named here were approached on that basis—maybe on the other basis, too—but they could have been approached on a basis that this was an entirely peaceful activity.

This group came into contact with us in the united front, in the surge of the united-front activity.

Mr. DOYLE. After lunch, Mr. Chairman, and at the convenience of counsel, I wish this very fine witness could give us any conclusion he has as to the relationship of the firing of Earl Browder from the American Communist Party.

Mr. HANCOCK. I am sorry, sir, but that happened after I left.

Mr. DOYLE. Then there had been no move prior to your leaving the activity as to Earl Browder being discharged?

Mr. HANCOCK. No; he was the leader at the time.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Thank you.

Mr. JACKSON. I think this is a very good time to break.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock, and reconvene at that time.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 2:50 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson (presiding), Francis E. Walter, and Clyde Doyle; the following staff members being present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel, Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk, and George B. Cooper, investigator.)

Mr. JACKSON. The session of the subcommittee will continue at this time.

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY B. HANCOCK—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hancock, at the beginning of the recess you were talking of an experience that you had in the Communist Party when a high functionary was sent from New York to San Diego to correct certain deviations on your part.

Will you tell the committee what you were referring to and explain the situation, please?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

It is a part of the party structure to encourage the establishment of bookstores in every possible community. These were generally known as peoples book stores, or something of that nature, a name like that. We had one such in San Diego. Most of the literature came directly through party channels. It consisted of little pamphlets. One publishing company by the name of International Publishers produced party books in hard covers, and some considerable material was apparently shipped in from Russia in the form of pamphlets, one magazine being somewhat in the format of Life magazine, called Soviet Russia Today; another being U. S. S. R. Construction; and a series of pamphlets or tracts which excited the attention of Paul Alexander and myself.

The general tenor of these tracts was violently unacceptable in this country, consisting of long praises of Joe Stalin, the great leader, Joe Stalin, our father who taught us how to farm chickens, or how to dig gold, or how to catch fish, and it just sounded downright stupid.

What we did in the eyes of the party was no doubt stupid, too, but Paul and I called a meeting of the county committee of the party and we put through a resolution, in the name of the county committee, that this nonsense ought to cease, and we sent it to the national committee.

Well, things happened. Within a short time, perhaps a couple of weeks, a party by the name of V. J. Jerome—

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. HANCOCK (continuing). Who was at that time a member of the national committee, an editor of the monthly theoretical magazine called The Communist, came into San Diego late one evening and gave us the task of calling the county committee together, and by all means to get a secretary, because every little pearl of wisdom he dropped had to be taken down.

So, I got the committee and the secretary, and we were in what amounted to an all-night session—broke up about 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning—at which time he lectured to us, accusing us of being—sounds fantastic, but—Trotskyite deviationists.

This is a dream world; you know you can get so far and then you can begin to flounder.

The county committee didn't accept it, didn't accept his recommendation, and we all thought the whole outfit was going to be thrown out, but the wheels began to grind. As a matter of fact, I think some kind of a motion was passed correcting our misunderstanding of the value of this literature, but the original motion of sharp personal censorship was not passed.

So, he was somewhat disappointed at that, and some maneuvering began to take place, the ultimate result of which I found, not at all to my dissatisfaction, that I was no longer the leader of the party.

This began the 6-month process that I spoke about some time early in 1937, and in that 6 months' process Esco L. Richardson was appointed and/or elected county chairman, and I went up to Bakersfield as a CIO organizer.

That would be the mainstream of the complication, there being others of a similar and perhaps more minor dissident nature.

It was pretty well considered that even during the hectic days of 1934 when I went into Imperial Valley that I, well, I had my good points, but I was somewhat erratic.

Mr. WALTER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. On the record.

Mr. HANCOCK. It goes back to the fact that in 1934, when I was sent into Imperial Valley as an organizer for what was then a completely party-dominated agricultural union, created and dominated by the Communists—I forget the name of it; it was the forerunner of this one we spoke of later. UCAPAWA—the valley was in complete turmoil. We organized big strikes down there, and I was arrested. While awaiting trial, some kind of a meeting, I think it was a State committee meeting, was scheduled in San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. Committee meeting of what?

Mr. HANCOCK. State committee meeting of the Communist Party. And at such a time elections were to be held for a new State committee, and my name, as being somewhat in the news at that time, was put forth in nomination for State committee membership.

Sam Darcy, who was the district organizer, resisted it and I was not elected.

I just cite this to indicate the lack of complete agreement that began at that point and finally led up to V. J. Jerome's appearance, and from his appearance, actually, my party activity or party authority, I might say happily, began to wane.

I remained with the People's World for 3 years, or approximately so, but doing something that was largely routine newspaper work.

Mr. WALTER. When did you leave California?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I enlisted in the merchant marine out there in January 1943. I got back—

Mr. WALTER. At that time were you still in the party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I was maintaining a home in Santa Cruz, Calif. Some time, I suppose I could say around 1944, my official residence—

Mr. WALTER. But when did you get out of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. 1940.

Mr. JACKSON. A total period of about 9 or 10 years?

Mr. HANCOCK. About 9 years, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us return at this point to your discussion of the group which met for the purpose of laying plans for infiltration of the American Federation of Labor.

You will recall that I reviewed with you the names of some of those that you had mentioned. The last one that I mentioned was Daisy Lee Worcester. You stated that she was a member of a teachers union?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us more about Communist Party activities within the Teachers Union?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, our contact with the Teachers Union was channeled through Daisy Lee Worcester, Harry L. Steinmetz, and one other teacher whose name escapes me.

I actually have no recollection of any policy that we instigated affecting the Teachers Union. I think it would be very true to say that we endeavored at that time to have the same policies carried out in the Teachers Union as we did in the Central Labor Council. We,

to the best of my recollection, controlled their delegates to the Central Labor Council, and the contest at that time was along the lines of rallying liberal and labor support for election activities, setting up united-front committees to sponsor candidates.

We never actually set up any such group in San Diego, but we endeavored to get the Central Labor Council to support that program and to have its delegates to the State labor federation convention support that program.

Mr. WALTER. Did you attempt to infiltrate the Central Labor Council?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, we did.

Mr. WALTER. In what manner?

Mr. HANCOCK. We covered that this morning.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, excuse me.

Mr. JACKSON. They finally succeeded in achieving complete domination.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. On the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of Dr. Harry Steinmetz—

Will you spell that name.

Mr. HANCOCK. S-t-e-i-n-m-e-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Being used in connection with the party plans and work in the Teachers Union. Will you describe that a little more fully?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, my concern was not in the Teachers Union as such because, to the best of my recollection, it was a small group. I have no recollection of it being actually representative of the teachers as a unit in San Diego, but our concern was to have these teacher contacts that we had represent the policy we favored in the Central Labor Council, and my recollection of it working back the other way—

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Except it would be truthful to say that consistency would require that you lay a foundation in the union to favor that policy on the floor of the Central Labor Council.

But I think the record will show it was a small group dominated by Worcester, Steinmetz, and a couple of other names that escape me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have spoken of Dr. Steinmetz' participation in the Central Labor Council and the part he played in the plans of the Communist Party to perfect your organization within that group.

Are you in position to definitely identify Dr. Steinmetz as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir; I am not. I have no further information than what I said this morning. I will restate it if you wish.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would state your position fully on that so that we may know just what you know about Dr. Steinmetz.

Mr. HANCOCK. I have to begin by saying I think it is quite likely that at one time or another every name mentioned was actually a member of the party. This happened about 20 years ago, and I cannot find in my memory the actual incident that would permit me to say I know they were members of the party. I do say that, with

reservations that result from interrelation of human beings, they performed as we desired them to. They knew that Paul Alexander and I were officials of the party. When we met with them we met with their knowledge that we were projecting official party policy.

The group had its beginning at a time when I was away from San Diego. It is a little unclear in my mind, but at a time when I was away, and I think it was that period when I was up 2 or 3 months on the Western Worker, there was a group came into existence called the Contradictory Social Problems Forum. So far as I know, it was just a belt organization into the party, but it attracted people of this stature. It was through that original group that I was able to make my contacts with them. The specific chain was a fellow by the name of Peter Carr, and my uncle, Henry Hancock, with members of this forum, cultivated some or several of these people and passed information on to me so that I might cultivate them, myself, and Paul Alexander.

I am not trying to hedge here. I will say everything that I know; but I don't want to say something that I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. And we are equally anxious that you do not.

Now, referring again to Dr. Steinmetz, how frequently do you think you conferred in an official way, that is, representing the Communist Party, with Dr. Steinmetz regarding the work of the party under circumstances which he must have known of the nature of the Communist Party's interest in the matter?

Mr. HANCOCK. I would say, generally speaking, over a period of several months, possibly up to a year, once every week or two, with some variations; people couldn't keep appointments or—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as leader of the Communist Party in that area at that time, wouldn't you have known whether Dr. Steinmetz was a member of the party or not?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; yes, I would, and no doubt at that time I did know. There would be no possibility of his being a member of the party without my knowing it.

I think you are asking why I don't know now what I knew then. I give you this answer: There is no question I knew at that time whether he was or he was not. I am inclined to believe he was, but I have nothing in my memory that permits me to give you the details of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Other than the fact that Dr. Steinmetz was carrying out Communist Party decisions?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, that would not necessarily tie down membership. We dealt with many people who, in one degree or another, carried out party wishes.

Mr. WALTER. Some of them unconsciously?

Mr. HANCOCK. That would be correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. But in the case of Dr. Steinmetz, it must have been with his knowledge, if I have understood your testimony correctly.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, it was certainly in his knowledge that in meeting with me he was meeting with the local leader of the Communist Party. Our relationship was on that basis.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know anything of the infiltration into the aircraft industry in southern California of Communists?

Mr. HANCOCK. There was something in—

One of these names here, this machinist, Mr. Cooper, that I spoke to you about——

Mr. COOPER. Kerrigan?

Mr. HANCOCK. No.

Mr. COOPER. Kepler?

Mr. HANCOCK. No.

Mr. COOPER. May I show you the list?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I think it would help.

It seems to me that right about that time Consolidated Aircraft came into existence.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. McDermott, James McDermott, a local—I think he lived in La Mesa—real-estate agent who had for years retained his membership in the machinists union, and was a member of the Communist Party, became active in the machinists union as it began to work in Consolidated Aircraft.

It is very hazy in my mind, except to say that we were interested in the development of the union. I don't recall that we had any particular influence there except through McDermott, who was our source of information.

Mr. WALTER. What happened to McDermott?

Mr. HANCOCK. I have no idea, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Is he still there, do you know?

Mr. HANCOCK. My contact with the people in San Diego ceased largely in 1937.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, excuse me.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was McDermott's first name?

Mr. HANCOCK. James; James McDermott.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement that he was a member?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, it is very strongly in my mind that in all the contact I had with James McDermott it was that of his being a party member.

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. HANCOCK. There is no doubt in my mind at all that he was a card-carrying member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with his wife?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her name?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, it is on the list. It escapes me now.

He didn't work in Consolidated, but when Consolidated came into existence the machinists union, or the IAM [International Association of Machinists], claimed jurisdiction, went in and started organizing, and McDermott was just a lay member; as such, entitled to attend the meetings. And there were other people we had contact with, 1 or 2, but it is very vague in my mind, and the contacts, I think, would have come through McDermott.

I have no knowledge of our attaining any influence in the Consolidated group. We had information, but not influence. We knew what was going on.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean, you had information?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, through McDermott, and I am sure there were 1 or 2 others. We knew—I think that it will develop that McDermott got himself appointed as some kind of an organizer for the machinists union, I think without pay, but nevertheless, some kind of an organizer, and I can't think of these other people.

One or two other minor characters were in the union in positions to advise us, keep us fully informed of what the union's plans were for extending their organization, making their contractual demands on management, and so forth.

We should have been delighted to be influential. We were not at the time I was in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general type of information which you received through McDermott?

Mr. HANCOCK. It would have to do with his relaying to us information given at the union meetings on grievances described by the shop stewards, plans of the officials to build up their membership to a point of demanding recognition of the union, wage demands, and that sort of thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that information useful to the Communist Party as a basis for making the issues of the union the issues of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, we considered it useful for the purpose of having a knowledge of an important field which we hoped would permit us to gain further adherence from the employees there, and eventually assume considerable influence in the aircraft industry. That was the ultimate intention.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee any further information regarding Communist Party activity within the airplane field?

Mr. HANCOCK. I don't believe I can; but, to place this period in relation to the overall situation, I perhaps should mention that at the same time we developed some influence in the fishermen's union and in the longshoremen's union.

In the longshoremen's union, which was already in existence, we had—the names escape me—1 or 2 party members. It is a small organization in San Diego, maybe a hundred people altogether at that time.

Mr. WALTER. The fishermen's union, was it up at San Pedro?

Mr. HANCOCK. Our union was affiliated to the one at San Pedro.

Now, that is a development which, to the best of my recollection, took place in this 6-month period of my diminishing control and influence in San Diego. I remember that somebody was sent down from San Pedro to take charge, and to create and take charge of the San Diego Fishermen's Union, and that person was a party member.

Mr. WALTER. What was his name?

Mr. HANCOCK. I have no idea, and I haven't run across it in any of these names, either.

Mr. WALTER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. On the record.

Mr. HANCOCK. So this person, who was not known to me before, came in and introduced himself as a fellow party member, was appointed as secretary of the fishermen's union, and they had a pretty lively group; and about at that point I went up to Bakersfield to organize the CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about your activity in the longshoremen's union?

Mr. HANCOCK. We had 1 or 2 members. We succeeded by having people like Lee Gregovich, whose name is on the list, talk to the already elected officials. We succeeded in pretty well holding them in line for the State federation of labor convention in San Diego and, of course, they came in contact with Harry Bridges and his crowd, and the group came down. We exercised some influence——

Let me go back just a bit here.

We issued a mimeographed newspaper, trade-union newspaper, called Trade Union News. We issued it for a couple of years. It came out every week. It was printed anonymously. I believe we said it was published by rank and file members of the American Federation of Labor. It, at one time, played a rather important part in this overall struggle.

The contents of this weekly mimeographed publication consisted of reports from various unions on what actually went on during the union meeting. Also, it was heavily larded with editorials on our own issues or drives.

I have in my memory getting reports from somebody in the longshoremen's union as to just what went on in the meeting, and we would report it in there, report it anonymously.

We also had, through some method that escapes me, secured the membership list of the longshoremen's union, so we sent it to all the longshoremen and it developed some influence on them in this manner. We sent it to several hundred trade unionists in San Diego, and it was presented in such a way that it exercised for a period some decisive influence.

We had such reports from perhaps 15 or 20 unions, in addition to what went on in the Central Labor Council.

Mr. WALTER. How was it paid for?

Mr. HANCOCK. By donations from the trade union members of the Communist Party. The cost was very little.

Mr. WALTER. Was anybody else solicited?

Mr. HANCOCK. Solicited—no, no.

Mr. WALTER. Just the Communist members of the union?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, I would have to qualify that. It was a part of our strategy that when somebody would express interest in appreciation of the contents then they would be asked if they didn't want to contribute; and I think we carried appeals in there, "Send in a dollar for a subscription," or something like that. But actually to put it out, it probably cost us \$10 a week and it represented no financial problem.

Mr. TAVENNER. This may be a very good place for you to tell the committee more about the [California] State Federation of Labor convention which you have mentioned several times, as to what part the Communist Party played in that convention.

You told us about the fraction meeting which occurred prior to that convention.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. We would like to know what the objectives of the Communist Party were in that convention, as well as to understand how the party manipulated its work.

Mr. HANCOCK. May I say to begin with that I have made a comprehensive report of this activity to the Bureau of Immigration and——

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. On the record.

Mr. HANCOCK. You may observe that I struggle mightily to recall these incidents, and it is quite possible I will deviate in some respect from what I have already said. I just say that that is the way things come back to mind, and will tell it the best I can.

We did research very heavily into it, to the point where I took a couple of days in the I. & S. offices in San Francisco and read all the Western Workers of that period to refresh my memory, bring back incidents, names, and so forth, and it helped. That was 1949, 5 years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that work done on the west coast or was it done in Washington.

Mr. HANCOCK. No; it was done on the west coast in the office of the I. & S. in San Francisco. So it is a complicated thing; I may leave out things; I may not have them in exactly the right sequence, but I will do the best I can with them.

Mr. WALTER. Are there any Communists coming across the border, I mean in any appreciable number?

Mr. HANCOCK. You mean from Mexico?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. You know, it is rather interesting—first of all, I have to say no.

Secondly, there was one period when Communists from Tijuana came into our bookstore in San Diego and invited us—they were Communist officials of the labor unions down there—invited us to come to their labor council meetings. I went—and understood very little, it all being in Spanish.

Mr. WALTER. Actually, it is very difficult for any white person to get across the border without proper identification, isn't it; a Mexican can do it?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir, when you live on the border there is no requirement; as I recollect, you can get into Tijuana at almost any time of the day or night. It seems to me they ask you questions like "How long are you going to be here?" Like Canada, if you are going to stay for several days you have to get visas, and what-not, I think, but during prohibition days the whole population went down to Tijuana, drank their beer, and came back in the evening.

Mr. JACKSON. It is open. They used to have a 6 o'clock closing time, but they changed that.

Mr. HANCOCK. Maybe I could say briefly something that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was interested in, and it is awfully sketchy but perhaps plays a part in your overall thinking here. To the best of my knowledge I was in contact just once with a person whom I was advised was a C. I. representative, representative of the Communist International. This happened sometime around 1935 at my home in San Diego, a small, rather slender fellow whose features I cannot recall. He came to my house and properly identified himself and did not say himself that he was C. I. representative but wanted me to become the State organizer of the Young Communist League.

It was not my wish to do so. I have no doubt at that time I was flattered at the request. I was asked to think it over. I made no move in that direction but later the Young Communist League leader in Los Angeles, Ben Dobbs, spoke to me about the incident and identified this person whose name is in my mind as Max somebody, as a C. I. representative. That was considered a very exciting event, to deal with such a person. I have looked at pictures and searched my mind for further details but that is the only thing that I can recall about this person supposedly from Russia.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent were the activities of the San Diego County organization integrated or coordinated with the Los Angeles County?

Mr. HANCOCK. In the very early days we were set up as a part of Los Angeles. As another name, I have just thought of Ida Rothstein, who was my original contact. In the very earliest days of my contact with the Communist Party, I attended the Los Angeles County committee meetings. They were not called county committee meetings. I cannot remember what they were called. The term "county committee" came into existence in the united front period. Somewhere in the first few months when San Diego was separated as a separate unit, it became answerable to San Francisco or what was then called the district 13 office, which originally included California, Arizona, Idaho, and Oregon; I think Oregon. Seattle was another district. Later California became a unit itself and outside of the first few months we were a part of the State organization answerable to San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the person you mentioned by the name of Max, was that Max Bedacht?

Mr. HANCOCK. Oh, no; I know that name. He was a rather elderly fellow in the International Workers' Order. This was a young man with no connection at all with that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were about to describe for us the activity of the party in connection with the convention of the [California] State Federation of Labor.

Mr. DOYLE. I wonder if the record should not show how you know that this man who gave you the invitation to the Young Communist League probably operated from Russia? You mentioned supposedly from Russia.

Mr. HANCOCK. I thought I covered that. I was so advised by the head of the Young Communist League in Los Angeles.

Mr. DOYLE. He did not tell you himself?

Mr. HANCOCK. I don't recall that.

Mr. DOYLE. You say he identified himself to you. As what?

Mr. HANCOCK. I cannot say exactly, but suitable identification would be to have some message from our State organization. I can say very definitely that subsequent inquiry on my part in the State organization confirmed he was a CI representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the head of the Young Communist League in Los Angeles?

Mr. HANCOCK. Ben Dobbs. The circumstances in relation to the State Federation of Labor convention in San Diego were as follows: Some few weeks prior to the convention date, a man by the name of Jack Johnstone, and I have since been told he is dead, and I thought at that time he was an Englishman, I understood at that time he was

a charter member of the national party and he was a cantankerous old soul, if I do say so, he came to San Diego interested in the preparation of the San Diego organization for the State convention. These preparations were to, union by union, do our best to have the right delegates elected to the State convention meeting and whatever delegates were elected, to start working on them to support our program. Our program consisted of several things, one a leftwing slate of officers headed by Harry Bridges; No. 2, such resolutions as create and support a united labor party; several other leftist resolutions, such as opposing the criminal syndicalism law.

In 1949 I reviewed the minutes of the convention and was able to recall a great deal more. But this was the general tenor of our activity. Just a day or two before the convention began, Walter Lambert, who had the title of State trade union director for the Communist Party, came to town and advised me that several of the northern delegates who are also party members were arriving in town. Some of them had taken rooms at a place called the Sumner apartments at 12th and B Streets in San Diego, just took rooms there. That is all. We later had a meeting. I know A. C. Rogers was there and possibly Harry Steinmetz, Harry Bridges was there, Jack Johnstone, a fellow by the name of Raven, a member of the Los Angeles Cleaners and Dyers Union, some sailors from the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, and some longshoremen. These names are on record. It was not in my memory at that time. At this time we went over strategy as to how we would conduct our fight on the floor of the convention.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Henry Schmidt there?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I am quite sure he was. He was in that group at that time.

Mr. WALTER. In view of the fact that it was not and is not a crime to be a Communist, why were so many meetings held by Communist Party members surrounded with such secrecy?

Mr. HANCOCK. First of all, I must say it was a very realistic policy for the Communists in the light of subsequent events. At that time some of it was due to the presence of people who were either first- or second-generation foreign born who brought with them memories of the revolutionary activities overseas.

Mr. WALTER. You had be better be careful now. I was charged with being anti-Semitic because I mentioned the names of many of these people. We had a hearing of Philadelphia school teachers and after a while I became struck by the names and I asked one of the witnesses where she was born, and she told me in the United States. I asked her where her parents were born and she said Russia. Then Mr. Kunzig, counsel for our committee, said that 39 out of 40 of the school teachers were either sons or daughters of fathers or mothers, or both, who were born in Russia.

You seemed to have confirmed the very thing that sort of entered my mind. They brought this Old World revolutionary ideology with them.

Mr. HANCOCK. Secrecy and so forth. I have no idea what percentage of Russians were there, but it was during my period, especially in the early days, first and second generation of foreign-born people were of a rather large percentage in the organization, of whom a large percentage were Jewish and perhaps an equal percentage Russian. Bear in mind we are not talking about large numbers. Communists operate in small groups.

Mr. WALTER. But why the secrecy? It was not a crime.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, the atmosphere was that you were steeped in the education of the struggles of the Communist Party, Russian Communist Party. The history of that party goes back to 1905 where they had a bloody revolution and it was beaten down and I think, to a large degree, the people who were there were establishing the mood and atmosphere, they were reflecting Old World experiences. I think there is something more in identifying my, I am sorry to say, slow drifting away from the Communist Party—with a growing comprehension of the Russian influence in the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER. Weren't some of these people, and I have given this an awful lot of thought since the other day, weren't these people ashamed because they realized, perhaps only subconsciously, that it was not in the best interests of the worker whom they spoke for to do what they were doing?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think there was an element of that, a shame of another form. People were fearful they would lose their jobs if they were not secretive about it.

Mr. DOYLE. I asked you something about revolutionary teachings and philosophy, even though it was not an illegal party. Was the secrecy of the place of meeting promulgated from the top because the top hard-core Communists, even at that time, were consciously aware that they were advocating that at some time there would be a necessary forceful revolution in the United States? Am I in error on that?

Mr. HANCOCK. I believe you are correct. If I may say so, while San Diego was only a small part of the State and national activity, it never had the deep significance of the struggles on the San Francisco waterfront, but the fact is that as local leaders, we were required to be theoreticians, or attempt to be, and we made considerable studies of communism beginning with *Das Kapital*, written by Marx, and various volumes by Engels and so forth, and Lenin's contributions. It was a great party activity at one time to publish and have widely disseminated 10 volumes by Lenin and the person who considered himself a Communist leader had this knowledge in mind, which was simply a quote, or at least the sense of a quote, from some of Lenin's writings, that in order to bring about the Communist state there were several requirements: One is the failure on the part of the opposition to act, the paralysis of the opposition, the breakdown of existing society as No. 1. No. 2, a strong and evident indication of revolutionary zeal or fervor among large parts of the population.

They say nothing about leadership at this point. The populace, by various tests, is ready to move into revolutionary action. No. 3, the existence of a hard Communist core which, at the signal, will say, "Now start shooting," which is one way of expressing it. These are the three major requirements that party theoreticians say are necessary for a movement into a Communist dictatorship.

Mr. JACKSON. On that point of secrecy, isn't it a true evaluation to state the very nature of revolution is secret?

Mr. HANCOCK. I would say so.

Mr. JACKSON. When you go to the barricades, you don't tell the police, and in the depths of the being of every philosophical Marxist-Leninist is the knowledge that he is doing something which is contrary to law in seeking this eventual revolution by force which necessitates,

in turn, that he cloak all his activities consciously and subconsciously in such things as assumed names, secret meeting places, and things of that sort. It seems to me that violent revolution is inherent in the Communist philosophy, and as a consequence you don't tell the policeman when you are going to start shooting.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think you could say yes. You could almost say when you are proposing to rob a bank you don't hold your discussions on the subject in the public square.

Mr. JACKSON. Exactly.

Mr. HANCOCK. And that you know sooner or later that there will be a conflict with the existing authority. It is important to bear in mind the wild violations in the Communist Party in point of time. In the early united front time, there was a wild speculation of bringing this all about peaceably. I think they were permitted and Browder's ascendancy was a part of the domination of this theory, it was permitted as perhaps a necessary evil, the old hard-core revolutionaries, of course, felt that that was nonsense, but if you can bring in people, liberals and leftists, let them believe it can be voted in and then show them it cannot be voted in.

If I may, let me say something I have in mind here, something that is an essential part of the Communist strategy and drives an awful lot of people out of the Communist Party, and I am speaking now of violence. I don't know about anyone else, but we learned, and it was a bitter pill to take, that there were times when the Communists wanted violence. We were never told that. We just saw it happen. We were told that we would prepare ourselves for the violent struggle because those in power will never give it up willingly and when the people overwhelmingly express their desire for something and it is denied them, they have every right to fight for it. George Washington was a revolutionary, and so forth.

I have in mind several minor events that convince me that it is an integral part of the Communist Party philosophy to provoke violence. Something happened in San Diego, and the name Leo Gallagher, an attorney of some prominence in Los Angeles, came up, associated with the Civil Liberties. In that period of time, I was in San Francisco and there was some kind of people's demonstration organized. They brought a lot of people down from Los Angeles to attend this thing. Most of the people were Los Angeles people. My mother was there and of course several other people when I came back from San Francisco told me about it. They wanted to parade from some open park up to some place. It seems to me it was to the Unitarian Church. I don't know. The permit for the parade had been denied. There was a little hysteria in the air and the police were present to prevent the march, and although the name escapes me now, there was quite a violent repercussion in our ranks because the party provoked the riot that ensued. In the face of this overwhelming authority which said "No, you cannot march," they started marching, and my recollection is that they had their kids there and they put their kids out in front, and I am only telling you what was told to me. My mother had a very violent reaction to it. I think she was there. It was very sharp in her mind. There was quite a bit of screaming and I remember the expression, the people from Los Angeles used language we never heard of. They called the policemen cossacks. They must have come

from Russia to use such expressions. We had in our mind that the party provoked that riot. Several people were arrested and were beaten and it was made a big civil-liberties deal and it seems to me the court case petered out. Leo Gallagher was the defending attorney. Maybe somebody went to jail. I think not. I think finally it was dismissed.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say they brought down the people from Los Angeles. Who was "they"?

Mr. HANCOCK. It was an organizational activity of the Communist Party, to the best of my knowledge, that is what it was. If I am testifying in a court of law, I have to say exactly what I know. I tell you that is what I know as well as I am in this room. I know the party organized it, but it would be difficult to say that this man who was a party man organized this action. There was no question but what I am saying was that it was a party activity. I was a participant in an activity in the Imperial Valley, where we had several thousand, 6,000, I think it was, workers on strike. The wage at that time was 18 cents an hour. We had demands for 25 and 30 cents an hour. In the early stages, the growers who, I am sorry to say, were badly hurt by those activities, were ready to negotiate. A fellow by the name of Elmer, real name Efim Hanoff, was present as the State representative in the Imperial Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. State representative of what?

Mr. HANCOCK. Of the State committee of the Communist Party. A young lady by the name of Dorothy Ray and myself were running the strike. It was one of those spontaneous things that all of a sudden we had 6,000 people, soup kitchens, and miles of cars picketing. We had an offer from the growers of 2 cents. It made sense to accept it, even from the Communist Party point of view, even from my knowledge of it. We had no organization. These people were desperate. Under directions, direct instructions from Efim Hanoff, I was not permitted to accept it. I was subsequently arrested and served 6 months in the Imperial County jail. Hanoff, being an undercover man all the time, escaped and rushed up to San Francisco to make a report to the State committee, which was printed in the Western Worker in some abbreviated form. When I was released on bail, I went to San Francisco just in time to get to the State convention, and that was the conflict I mentioned earlier, being somewhat in the news I was nominated for a member of the State committee and Sam Darcy, the State organizer, and working very closely with Hanoff, vetoed it. Here again the party did not want the solution. At least they did not want it at that time. Commonsense and every intelligence demanded that it should be done. I think without question to some degree this agricultural foment in California at that time was fostered by the party with the thought in mind of whipping up something tremendous.

Perhaps you gentlemen recall there were strikes in the cotton fields, in the lettuce fields, in the packing sheds. The party played a pretty influential part in those activities. I know nothing about the administration of it. But my own little experience in the Imperial Valley gave me the feeling that there was something screwy here.

Mr. WALTER. Where did the orders come from?

Mr. HANCOCK. There is a chain of command. I will tell you what I know and what I believe. Many of those came from the State. For instance, my orders came from the State leaders of the party.

Mr. WALTER. For example, in the Imperial Valley situation, did the leaders of the Communist Party in California discuss the advisability of settling this strike with the Communist Party leaders of the United States before orders were transmitted to you?

Mr. HANCOCK. Did they discuss it with the national organization?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think not. I think it would not be done for that. Usually there is some labor representative in the State office, at least where there is something happening, and he will speak for the national committee.

Mr. WALTER. Is that the situation here?

Mr. HANCOCK. I cannot say because I was in the Imperial Valley and our lines of communication were very bad.

Mr. WALTER. But in most instances where a situation of this sort existed, there was somebody present at State headquarters to give the proper national guidance?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is correct. I think I can go a bit further. It is my very strong belief, based on my experience in that period of time in the labor group, that there was a C. I. representative. In the State group, especially when things began to get exciting, there is a national representative and, as previously testified, right on down on the scene of the strike there was a State representative.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, to some degree, the entire activity of a local strike was controlled by a representative of the Russian Cominform?

Mr. HANCOCK. At least in policy, general strategy; that would be correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred a number of times to the Western Worker. Do you know where we may obtain copies of the Western Worker?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. Copies at one time were on file in the public library of San Francisco. I think many libraries in California will have them. The I. N. S. brought me a complete file, bound file.

Mr. HANCOCK. That was the predecessor to the Daily People's World?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. I recalled it. They were asking me so many things that I said, "Get me the papers and let me look through." It is almost, in some respects it is, a minute account of what the Communists are interested in and there are all kinds of names in there too, and so they brought me several bound volumes. I pored over them for 2 or 3 days.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us return again now to the convention of the State federation of labor which you were describing. I believe at the point when we began discussing these other matters you were telling us of a fraction meeting at some hotel.

Mr. HANCOCK. The Sumner Apartments. This was the subject of my testimony at the Harry Bridges trial in San Francisco. The I. & S. took me to California and took me into the Sumner Apartments to see if I could find the room we met in. I could not, except that I was clear in my mind that that was where we met. They wanted to develop something further.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were telling us the objectives of the Communist Party and then you started to describe this fraction meeting which I assume was for the purpose of outlining the strategy to be used.

Mr. HANCOCK. On the floor of the convention.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I think you have already given us the names of those who took part in this fraction meeting, including Harry Bridges.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is correct. I am trying to think if I have left out any names that I am familiar with. I have left out names of people there. There were roughly 8 to 12 people there. Some of the people I met for the first and last time at that meeting. The significant names I have given. When you mentioned Henry Schmidt, I am quite sure I testified, which means I recognized him as one of the persons present, but my previous testimony will show that. I think he was on trial with Bridges in this thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. If I saw a roster, I would recognize other names of the seamen and sailors. Oh, I know, big John Shoemaker was there.

The gist of it was this was the procedure in which, in effect, it was a State fraction meeting, fraction meeting being different from what I was used to in that I would organize meetings of all members and possibly friends of our members in a given San Diego organization going to influence that meeting and there was a meeting where Bridges and the northern people were present with our southern people. If I recall correctly, it was the duty of the San Diego chairman, which would have meant Harry Steinmetz, to open the meeting as the host council. Harry Steinmetz made a welcoming speech and turned the meeting over to Ed Vanderleur, who was State president.

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought Vandeleur was the head of the opposition to the Communist Party.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, he was; but the convention was held in our city.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think you might tell us what occurred at this fraction meeting which was attended by Harry Bridges before coming to the convention itself.

Mr. HANCOCK. I would like to start by saying there must have been more than one fraction meeting. This being so long ago, I am recalling this particular incident. I think there were meetings that I did attend. I was not a trade-union delegate, and Walter Lambert's presence was the party representation. There must have been other meetings. I have knowledge of only this one. Jack Johnstone was the national representative present. Then the general tone of the meeting was to review who were the elected delegates from the important organizations. I cannot recall any single conversation, but it was important for us to make a last-minute count of who was coming down. I recall somebody was elected and his wife was sick and he could not get there and possibly would come later. We needed to determine our strength to begin with. We made some decisions that we would introduce this resolution and we would withhold these others. When we made that decision, then the representative of that union would take the resolution and lay it before the secretary of the convention. The slate of officers was a matter of concern to us. We debated who we would put up for president, who would we put up for secretary and who would we put up for the regional representatives of the State federation, and I forget the title. We had an opposition slate. Every area is entitled to a representative on the State

committee of the State federation. We had an opposition slate. So, at that last minute we were going over such things as is there any change necessary here? Is this fellow all right and shall we support this and so forth? These men that we supported included Communists and non-Communists, but by all means they had to be at variance with people like Vanderleur, a staunch conservative. That was the general nature of our fraction meeting.

Part of the strategy, too, was who will talk on this resolution, who will nominate this resolution and who will second the resolution. It gets very involved, but it is very effective when it works out.

Mr. TAVENNER. That brings you up to the convention itself?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You started to tell us that Dr. Harry Steinmetz opened the convention. What position did he hold which would entitle him to open the meeting?

Mr. HANCOCK. He was president of the San Diego Federated Council of Labor Unions, or a shorter name is the Central Labor Council. As such, he was the host officer and opened the meeting and made a speech and turned it over to Ed Vanderleur.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there anything that occurred during the course of that convention which would demonstrate the methods of operation of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, there was a very sharp floor fight. Incidentally, I must tell you that, and it comes back to me now that I sat in the gallery and sat and watched it and reported fully on it in the trade union news that we put out. I was disappointed, as a Communist, at what Harry Steinmetz said, from my point of view, which is another way of saying that we had no influence or did not choose to or did not try to get around to finding out what he was going to say.

To get into the actual proceeding of the meeting, the fraction meeting that we held was the core of a larger group of dissidents or opponents, of existing officers. It is proper strategy, accepted strategy, that they held a caucus meeting and through our good offices and through our control of the San Diego situation, we held it in the offices of the Central Labor Council where we invited all left-wing, I suppose we called it, or progressive or democratic delegates to attend so that the chain was that the decisions made at the party fraction which sometimes does include nonparty members and, to the best of my knowledge, everybody there was a party member, were then carried to the floor of the left wing caucus, and I don't recall any change being made in them, and on the basis of the approval of the left wing caucus, they were then presented on the floor of the convention. It builds up from a very tiny party membership involving a very few into a larger fraction and going into a left-wing caucus and then going on the floor of the convention. We had some sharp differences on the floor and some pretty violent words were mentioned on the floor.

In the show of strength Bridges was stronger than ever before, but I think roughly the Bridges ticket got 25 percent of the votes. It was considered a very marked step forward. And San Diego produced about 50 percent of the local vote. You see, the delegate votes for his members. We produced about 50 percent of the San Diego movements, and that excited comment all over.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you had delegates representing numerically about one-half of the union membership of San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, we did not have the delegates, but sympathetic to us and working with us were the highest officers like Steinmetz and so when their highest officers voted for us, the sheep went along.

Mr. DOYLE. Evidently from what you said you had not undertaken to control what the chairman said, Steinmetz. Did he say anything that you can now recall?

Mr. HANCOCK. Something that had no bearing on the clashes that were to come. It was one of those polite 5-or 10-minute speeches.

Mr. DOYLE. He was chairman of the convention?

Mr. HANCOCK. Opening chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Did he attend the meeting?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, he was not present. A. C. Rogers attended. By the way, I want to correct something in your notes there. You have on this list of names A. C. Rogers, Sr., and A. C. Rogers, Jr. Possibly there is some confusion here. An old fellow by the name of A. G. Rogers was there, editor of the trade-union publication of the labor movements, no connection with that whatsoever. I think you may have the confusion of A. G. Rogers and A. C. Rogers. I don't recall A. C. Rogers having a son. Maybe he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything in addition that you can tell us about the convention which you think would be of interest to the committee?

Mr. HANCOCK. I am sorry, I cannot. The preceding and the subsequent conventions all represented a continuation of this struggle, the one in San Diego I was more familiar with. It is my recollection that that represented something of a high mark in Harry Bridges' attempt to gain, to force his way into leadership in the State organization. At a later convention, he was actually elected as one of the regional directors of the State federation, but at this point there was a head-on clash to unseat the old people and take over the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Going back to the Central Labor Council again, I would like to ask you whether a person by the name of Sterling Campbell Alexander was connected with it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Sterling Campbell Alexander is the person I previously referred to as Paul Alexander.

Mr. TAVENNER. The same person?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, the same person.

Mr. WALTER. Suppose we made it illegal to participate in the activities of this group who are engaged in Communist Party activities? Would it make it more difficult for them to continue their conspiracy?

Mr. HANCOCK. I am really not qualified to answer that. I can give you a personal opinion but it is not very valuable. The first thing that comes to my mind is what will you then have done to move people who are left of center further over to the radical side? That is what the Communists think would happen. They think if you drive them over into illegality, they will get the staunch liberals closer and closer to the Communists. It seems to me if you make it absolutely illegal it ought to be highly restrictive. They are used to working in an illegal way, but it ought to restrict their capacity to find converts.

There are situations in the world that sort of belie that. For example, the Mexican Communist Party was declared illegal. It just sprang up under another name.

Mr. WALTER. I know. So many people don't realize the fact that you cannot make a party illegal. You can make it a crime or you can make it prohibitive to do a certain thing, which of course makes, in effect, the constitution of a group doing that thing illegal and thereby makes the party illegal, I suppose. I am wondering what effect it would have now when the party is underground if the activities of its members were spelled out precisely as constituting a crime against the United States.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I suggest what would happen is that the Communist Party, so named, would disappear, and the "American Labor something or other" would come into existence.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, but what it was doing would be the same as the Communists were doing, and that would be a crime.

Mr. JACKSON. You outlaw a specific sect or activity. It is a matter of definition.

Mr. HANCOCK. You have the greatest definition, the organization believing in overthrowing the Government. That is a very good definition and far better than to say Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. Isn't that under the Smith Act? It is already outlawed under that act.

Mr. JACKSON. Only the fact of conspiring to advocate and teach violence, but not membership in the party itself.

Mr. HANCOCK. I really don't know. I wish to God I did know the answer to that. I prefaced my remarks by saying I am not qualified. I tell you quite frankly that I am not one who believes that ex-Communists are oracles of wisdom. I think ex-Communists have very little to give to society.

Mr. WALTER. I do not agree with you therein. You have given us a great deal.

Mr. HANCOCK. I want to say that first of all it is important to throw light on what happens. There is a very great danger, and here I find that I come to a blank wall, I say there is a danger in what I personally cannot do anything about because of my past activities, but there is a danger that in creating restriction you will move people over from this side of the fence to that side of the fence.

I am a student of the English type of government, which encourages loyal opposition and has very real opposition. There is a terrific advantage in having the opposition out in the open so that you can bat them down.

Mr. JACKSON. There is a distinction between the loyal opposition and a disloyal opposition. I am certain that all of us are convinced that a 2 party system or a 3 party system is an excellent thing. We represent it here in the House. However, I think the general feeling of the American people is too often to consider the Communist Party as a political party, per se, as Americans know political parties, when actually it is not.

Mr. HANCOCK. No; it is not. Possibly the solution may be something in this field. First of all, I think that it would be very difficult for the Communists to escape their own doctrine which gives us all their literature steeped in that theory. Whatever they call themselves, they are identified with the existing definitions of communism. Let us say that theoretically this group can be outlawed.

Mr. WALTER. You fall right into the thing that many of us have fallen into. I always believed that if anything was wrong it could

not continue to exist, but this thing has been going on a long while and it is wrong, in my opinion.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is such a vast field. It goes on for two reasons, roughly. One is that it is fed by a foreign influence. Without Russia, it would not be a problem.

Mr. WALTER. How would anybody in his right mind today, having access to all of the means of communication that we have, permit Russia to dictate to him for 1 second? They know that there are slave labor camps. They know that in China, in order to eliminate opposition, 15 million people were murdered. Why would people tolerate it?

Mr. HANCOCK. They don't know about it. They won't believe it.

Mr. JACKSON. We have had witnesses who say that is simply propaganda on the other side.

Mr. HANCOCK. I believe it now, but I did not believe it for a long time.

Mr. JACKSON. What is your other reason?

Mr. HANCOCK. I sincerely believe that the American Communist movement is an instrument of Russian imperialism or, to be more specific, it is an instrument of the Russian National Government. The process of applying control over the American party is presented in a way that the average American has no concept of the actual Russian control. As a full-fledged, highly respected member of the Communist Party, I had very little concept of the roots running all the way back to Russia. Their representatives, in secrecy, meet with carefully selected American representatives, of whom a good percentage are foreign born, in the national committee of the American Communist Party. The others are brought into a frame of mind to accept that. In the highest leadership, they do have to accept the fact that there is foreign domination.

From that point on down, the foreign domination is diluted to the State groups and so forth. We were told to be very friendly to these Russian people who had blazed the trail for the rest of the world. We did not say that when the Russian snaps the whip the American Communist Party starts dancing. Enlightenment is the answer there.

The second question is why does this evil persist in your knowledge and mine? In my estimation, the second reason lies in the economy we live in, in the economic conditions and the times, the failure of society to properly carry out its obligations. I ask you to remember what little we did in San Diego and which was detrimental to society's best interests, where possible, because the local relief people were paralyzed. People were hungry and nobody did anything about it and the Communists jumped in. When we allow injustice to exist, or when we move too slowly to correct it, we allow unthinking, unintelligent people to move and say, "By God, it is time for somebody else to move in."

Mr. JACKSON. Were you acquainted with Charles Judson, a newspaper man?

Mr. HANCOCK. I don't recall the name.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Judson appeared and cooperated with the committee relative to a newspaper branch of the party in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to follow up your very interesting comments on the Communist Party generally. How did you and other Communist Party members rationalize the purges that were

conducted in Russia in 1935 and 1937 and 1938? What was the attitude of the Communist Party on those matters?

Mr. HANCOCK. One of complete acceptance of whatever explanation was made by the Stalin leadership. I recall some of the old-timers becoming violently upset by these purges. People who had been thinking at least about that subject for many years. For instance, Sol Bernhart was very upset at these purges because he could not understand how a man could be in such high leadership and then, all of a sudden, turns out to be a traitor from the very beginning. But it is to our discredit that unimportant segments of the Communist Party became upset at these purges. We became upset at other things, but the purges were so unrealistic to us. The explanation was that some terrible international influence created this and it is a good thing the party was alert enough to discover this, and so forth. Of course, now I know it was a pure struggle for power. If I may say so, I would say that my pattern of reaction is more American than normal Communist Party reaction. My background is entirely American. My people are Texans. My dad came from Kentucky. God knows how I ended up in the situation, but the thing that drove me out of the party was when Russia went into Poland.

I had a violent argument with the editor of the paper, who was Harrison George, and when it came over the radio and in the newspapers that Russia had invaded Poland, there was a joint announcement issued by the Russian generals in the field and the German generals in the field and there was a joint statement that these miserable Nazis had issued a joint statement with the Russians that they had come together for the good of the Polish people to drive out the reactionary Polish Government and between the great German Army and the Russian Army that peace would prevail. I liked to blow my lid. Harrison George said to me, "You are always looking for something and you had better clam up or you will get in trouble," or things of that kind, and that was just a few months before this Bridges testimony and before other agencies, but the way I left the party, it may dispel some mystery in your minds, is that first of all there is no such thing as a formal resignation from the party. If I personally were foolish enough to say, "I hereby resign from the party," that would have no significance. The party would then expel that person. You are a Communist until you are expelled or just dropped, but you don't resign. You don't say, "So-and-so resigned." They don't say, "God bless you and good luck."

Mr. WALTER. What about the Philadelphia schoolteachers? They were Communists until the time they took the loyalty oath. They took the oath and then apparently became Communists immediately afterward. How do they get out of the Communist Party, if they did, long enough to take that oath?

Mr. HANCOCK. They did not. Obviously they did not, and the same thing with Ben Gold. Ben Gold is a charter member of the Communist Party, and all of a sudden he signs the Labor Relations oath that he is not a Communist. Obviously, a man like that does not become a non-Communist overnight. They reached an impasse. Rather than retire from the organization, they decided to bluff it out.

Mr. DOYLE. Would it be that the officials did not even know?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, they might even put in the records a letter of resignation, but it would be meaningless.

Mr. JACKSON. In hearings such as the ones conducted by this committee or this meeting, will a hard-core Communist repudiate, under any circumstances, any of the statements of the party leaders, or any of the basic doctrines of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. The answer is a qualified yes, depending on the material of his particular work and the nature of his assignment. He will, to protect that assignment, become a violent anti-Communist; if necessary, ostensibly.

Mr. JACKSON. I have never seen it happen when confronted actually with a question, an answer to which would reflect upon the leadership internationally or here in this country, Communists who have failed to take the fifth amendment at that point. Possibly because very few, if any, present Communists have ever talked before this committee.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, a present-day Communist who was protecting his position as a Communist would follow the line you have just suggested. Say he was in secret or spy activity and dredged up in some way, he might talk as a complete and violent anti-Communist. I speak, not from personal knowledge, but general observation over the years.

Mr. JACKSON. Which is very important observation.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question, it always worries me, to what extent can we believe in the good faith and the sincerity of former Communists who say they have withdrawn, not only from the Communist Party, but from the precepts of the Communist Party? When we have folks come before us generally, would you say that most of them come before us in good faith, having actually renounced consciously within themselves, as well as probably the doctrines of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Unless they are in some highly secret activity, once they have renounced communism, they have denounced communism. The only exception would be a spy.

Mr. DOYLE. But wouldn't the Communist Party officially have John Doe come before us and probably renounce it and then go back in, in fact, never get out?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, they would not. You will identify a person like that by his evasion of the questions, a question such as "Don't you know that So-and-so was a direct representative of Russia?" They will evade a question like that.

And then a question like "Don't you know that the American Communist Party is an instrument of a foreign power?". Well, they may say no, but you will find them squirming around these questions. Anybody who is still identified with the Communist Party can hardly come before you and denounce the Communist Party and be considered of any value to the Communist Party. It is a part of the Communist reaction to divert or block these questions or to give you a roundabout answer or to hide behind the fifth amendment.

This is not a good example but it will give you some idea of what I am trying to say. The question that comes up about Communists being great advocates of racial equality, the question of "Do you want your daughter to marry a Negro?" and the proper response of a good Communist is always "I don't know any Negro who wants to marry my daughter." The man has maintained his position.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your appraisal and your opinion of the function of this particular un-American Activities Committee? Is it

doing a constructive job? Is it valuable? Is it worth a damn or two or three damns? What is the appraisal that we could get from you of this committee?

Mr. HANCOCK. Let me answer it in two main categories: No. 1, from the time that I got out of the Communist activity, I have been very nonpolitical in my reactions. I followed very little national and international events.

No. 2, I am greatly impressed by the value that comes from men like yourself concerning yourselves with a question that can only lead to good. There is something that I take for granted, the requirement being that men of good faith and good will probably evaluate the evidence that comes before you.

Mr. WALTER. Are we hurting them?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think publicity is a tremendous weapon to use against communism. I suggest, very humbly, that you have the capacity to do great damage to individuals as you expressed concern for not doing damage to this individual we mentioned. I think it is of great significance and offers potentially great good to men of your capacities to take the time to even consider the minute words that I have to say here. Only good can come from it.

I would like to lay certain facts before you. I came here, not wishing to say the words, but to give you the truth as it is within me of the events and without reservation, to persuade you by deeds that I desire to be completely cooperative.

I at this point want to remind you that I have personally suffered great misfortune by my original decision to testify at the Harry Bridges trial. I lost my position, the only field I am qualified to work in, and it took me 2 years to get back into the work. I have a fine wife and a fine daughter.

Mr. WALTER. Where was this?

Mr. HANCOCK. In Erie, Pa. The circumstances are such that in my line of work we also have an opposition newspaper. I have an opposition newspaper now and it is the nature of the sources that what I have told you if it becomes public information, it will make it impossible for me to continue in my present line of work. I speak not theoretically, but it has already happened to me, the only difference now being that the people I work for are now fully aware of my background, but that changes not one whit the fact that the opposition newspaper can crucify me.

Mr. WALTER. How can they?

Mr. HANCOCK. I can only tell you how they did.

Mr. WALTER. How did they?

Mr. HANCOCK. The Erie Times, which is the paper in constant conflict with the Erie Dispatch, went way out of their way by telephoning several times to San Francisco when I was at the trial to have photographs taken of me, and extensive quotes, and they had their Washington representative digging up my entire background. They talked about the Imperial Valley struggle and the fact that I was arrested and served time in jail and as public relations director of a newspaper, and my employers had no choice.

Mr. WALTER. When was this?

Mr. HANCOCK. In December 1949.

Mr. WALTER. And they fired you?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. They were cowardly.

Mr. HANCOCK. I respectfully disagree.

Mr. WALTER. Was there a fellow on that paper, the editor, by the name of Keith?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, his name was White, that was our editor.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know Donald Keith?

Mr. HANCOCK. No.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that in the event anyone does in anyway attempt to penalize the witness for his contribution that he has made to the security of the country, it will indicate the need for legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. To me, not only the punitive action against this witness, Mr. Chairman, but the using of his voluntary contribution toward the security of our Nation against the Communist conspiracy in the field of competition, this man is employed by a newspaper, think how terrible it would be if a rival newspaper should capture this incident and capitalize on it in order to hurt the other competitor.

Mr. WALTER. I am prepared to state that we should subpoena the persons responsible before this committee in open session if any such thing should happen and have a showdown on that subject.

Mr. DOYLE. I would like to see that.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say before I leave, this is precisely the point I wanted to touch at the conclusion of this testimony. I personally think, and I am sure that it is the expression of the entire committee and of the Congress of the United States, that in making this appearance here you have rendered signal service to the committee, the Congress and the American people. It is not an easy thing to do, as you yourself have pointed out. But, without such testimony as you have given here today, the American people would not have the tremendous total knowledge of the operations of the Communist Party that they do have, and because they have it I think that this nation is probably more alert to and more aware of the true nature and significance of the Communist Party than any people on earth. That, I say, is due to testimony such as yours. It would certainly be the hope of the Chair that under no circumstances, irrespective of what may in the future be done with this testimony—and we cannot foresee at the moment what may be necessary to do—but I would certainly express the thought that retaliatory action of any kind taken against you or against any other witness who sees it as his obligation to come before the Congress or this committee or any committee to give such testimony, is reprehensive and would destroy the work of this committee more rapidly and more effectively than could the Communist Party itself.

I want to express to you the thanks of the Committee on un-American Activities for your lucid, comprehensive and splendid testimony today.

With that, the committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:05 p. m., the hearing was adjourned to reconvene on Monday, March 1, 1954.)



INDEX TO PART 1

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Alexander, Paul (<i>see also</i> Alexander, Sterling Campbell)-----	4534,
	4535, 4541, 4544, 4557
Alexander, Sterling Campbell (<i>see also</i> Alexander, Paul)-----	4557
Ball, Lucille-----	4525
Bedacht, Max-----	4549
Bernhart, Sol-----	4522, 4535, 4560
Billings, Warren K-----	4526
Bridges, Harry-----	4519, 4536, 4547, 4550, 4554, 4555, 4557, 4560, 4562
Browder, Earl-----	4540, 4552
Carr, Peter-----	4544
Darcy, Sam-----	4553
Dimitroff, Georgi-----	4527
Dobbs, Ben-----	4549
Dowell-----	4535
Duclos-----	4540
Fisher, Mark-----	4534, 4537
Gallagher, Leo-----	4552, 4553
Garrigues, Charles H. ("Brick")-----	4535, 4537
George, Harrison-----	4560
Gold, Ben-----	4560
Green, Bill-----	4536
Gregovich, Lee-----	4547
Gue, Stanley-----	4535
Hancock, Henry-----	4533, 4544
Hancock, Stanley B-----	(testimony) 4517-4563
Hanoff, Elmer (Efim; Effim)-----	4553
Hillkowitz, Saul-----	4522
Jerome, V. J-----	4541, 4542
Johnstone, Jack-----	4549, 4550, 4555
Jones, Claude L-----	4533
Judson, Charles-----	4559
Keith, Donald-----	4563
Lambert, Walter-----	4550, 4555
Levin, Meyer-----	4521-4523
Leyden, Johnnie-----	4534
Lovestone, Jay-----	4522
Lydick, John-----	4534, 4538
McDermott, James-----	4545, 4546
Meyers, Frank S-----	4521
Mooney, Tom-----	4526
Pollack, Harry-----	4519
Raven-----	4550
Ray, Dorothy-----	4553
Richardson, Esco L-----	4524, 4541
Rogers, A. C-----	4533-4538, 4550, 4557
Rogers, A. G-----	4557
Rothstein, Ida-----	4549
Schmidt, Henry-----	4550, 4555
Shoemaker, John-----	4555
Steinmetz, Harry L-----	4534, 4535, 4542-4544, 4550, 4555-4557
Stromberg, Yetta-----	4526
Vandeleur, Ed-----	4536, 4555, 4556
Worcester, Daisy Lee-----	4534, 4538, 4542
Wosk, David-----	4534, 4538

ORGANIZATIONS

	Page
American Federation of Labor-----	4532, 4535, 4536, 4542, 4547
Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization-----	4524, 4548
California Committee to Repeal the California Syndicalism Act-----	4521
California State Federation of Labor-----	4532, 4547, 4549
Central Labor Council, San Diego---	4532, 4533, 4535, 4542, 4543, 4547, 4556, 4557
Cleaners and Dyers Union, Los Angeles-----	4550
Cominform-----	4554
Comintern-----	4527
Committee for Amnesty to the Smith Act Victims-----	4530
Committee to Free Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings-----	4526
Communist International-----	4548, 4549, 4554
Communist Party, San Francisco Central Committee-----	4535
Congress of Industrial Organizations-----	4541, 4546
Consolidated Aircraft Corp-----	4545
Contradictory Social Problems Forum-----	4544
Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace-----	4530
Federal Bureau of Investigation-----	4548
Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS)-----	4554
International Association of Machinists-----	4545
International Publishers-----	4541
International Workers' Order-----	4549
Sailors' Union of the Pacific-----	4550
San Diego Federated Council of Labor Unions-----	4556
San Diego Fishermen's Union-----	4546
San Diego Labor Council-----	4528
San Diego State College-----	4534
Teachers Union-----	4542, 4543
Unemployed Council-----	4526, 4529
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America, CIO-----	4518, 4542
Workers' Alliance-----	4529
Works Progress Administration-----	4518
Young Communist League, California-----	4548
Young Communist League, Los Angeles-----	4549

PUBLICATIONS

The Communist-----	4541
Daily People's World-----	4518-4520, 4542, 4554
Erie Dispatch-----	4562
Erie Times-----	4562
Lockport Union Sun and Journal-----	4519
Long Island Daily Press-----	4518-4520
Pasadena Star-News-----	4518, 4520
San Diego Labor Leader-----	4535
San Diego Sun-----	4518, 4520, 4521, 4535
Santa Cruz Sentinel News-----	4519
Scripps-Howard newspapers-----	4521, 4526
Soviet Russia Today-----	4541
Trade Union News-----	4547
U. S. S. R. Construction-----	4541
Western Worker-----	4518, 4544, 4548, 4553, 4554

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Part 2

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 1, MARCH 1, AND APRIL 12, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

Ent
Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 8 - 1954

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

COURTNEY E. OWENS, *Acting Chief Investigator*

CONTENTS

	Page
March 1, 1954, testimony of Stanley B. Hancock (resumed)-----	4565
February 1, 1954, testimony of Benjamin Holmes Haddock-----	4595
April 12, 1954, testimony of:	
Frances Burke-----	4619
Index-----	i



PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEE

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(g) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

(1) There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Part 2

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 11:15 a. m., in room 225, Old House Office Building, Hon. Clyde Doyle, presiding.

Committee member present: Representative Clyde Doyle.

Staff member present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the conclusion of the hearing conducted on February 24 the subcommittee chairman announced that the hearing would be continued to Monday, March 1, at 10:30 a. m. Pursuant to the direction of the chairman of the subcommittee the hearing is resumed at 11:15 a. m., March 1, 1954.

Present are Hon. Clyde Doyle, Member of Congress, and Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Tavenner, I just received notice of this hearing a few minutes ago, and while I am here in the committee room, as you know, I have always objected to a one-man subcommittee hearing, so I will not ask any questions nor participate in the hearing except just to sit here, not undertaking to function as a member of the committee. But because the witness' testimony does involve situations in my native State of California, where I reside, which I represent, I want to have the benefit of hearing his testimony.

I regret that the other members are not here.

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY B. HANCOCK—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hancock, during the course of your earlier testimony you described one major incident of infiltration of groups or organizations in San Diego by the Communist Party. This related in the main to the Central Labor Council at San Diego.

Will you tell the committee, please, what other principal efforts were made by the Communist Party while you were one of its leaders in San Diego to infiltrate other organizations?

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Tavenner, I do not have in my mind any other infiltration of consequence in the same sense as the one we are discussing. I no doubt would be better equipped to answer the question

¹ Released by the committee.

were I in a position to review events of that period, but I am confident that I have the general course of events in mind.

What stands out in my mind is, in that period the major activity was infiltration of the A. F. of L. Central Labor Council. There was something going on around then that had to do with election activity, and I am just not clear on it, but I think Dr. Harry Steinmetz was a candidate for something not backed by the Communist Party, but the general procedures of that election campaign, if not originated in our councils, were followed very closely and influenced by that activity.

I cannot think of the precise situation. It has to do with the opening up of the CP's united-front policy organizationally and politically.

I cannot even say that the man was a candidate or who the candidates were, but I think so, and I think—of course, he obviously was not elected, but our interest was in influencing men of that caliber to endeavor to either bring about what might be called a far-left-of-center local government in which we would exert some or considerable influence, or, failing in that, to run up the highest possible protest vote which would be considered a milestone on the road to eventual election success.

The two outstanding events of the period have to do with the activities in Imperial Valley as well as the Central Labor Council activity. For a time we were quite influential in Imperial Valley among the agricultural workers, and in answer specifically to your question, I just do not have in mind any other organization that we penetrated except in the sense I have already testified through delegates to the Central Labor Council we reached back into various organizations, and I do not have any in mind beyond that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you tell the committee how the Communist Party functioned in its work in Imperial Valley?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. This has to do with the period starting in early 1934. I am not too clear. The events which led up to our activity in Imperial Valley may have started around the fall of 1933, but there were a series of violent organizational activities in the San Joaquin Valley culminating in strikes in the cotton fields. I am not too sure of my dates here, but it seems to me that as these agricultural workers moved throughout the State—they followed a pattern, really, and it would be Salinas, down to the San Joaquin Valley and down over into the Imperial Valley and down to Yuma and make the circle again—I do not say that is the sequence, but they went roughly in a circle during the 12-month period—so that 2 people, Pat Chambers and Caroline Decker, party members, became somewhere in that period leaders of a completely Communist-controlled and established union for the agricultural field workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the name of the union?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, but I will tell you one thing: On the original membership books that came out, it said, "affiliated to the Red International of Labor Unions." It was not disguised in any way. I recall the original application cards, such a name, affiliated to the RILU, Red International of Labor Unions. It was a predecessor of the UCAPAWA.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will endeavor to refresh your recollection later about that.

Mr. HANCOCK. All right.

Pat Chambers and Caroline Decker, known Communist Party members, came into leadership of this organization, which grew like wild-fire in Salinas and central San Joaquin Valley, and not being a part of it, I have not too specific knowledge of the cumulative results, contractual or otherwise, but these workers by the thousands began pouring into Imperial Valley for their annual stint in the agricultural fields. That came into my territory, and I spent quite a bit of time in Imperial Valley, setting up locals of this Red union, and corraling the members who carried their cards from the San Joaquin Valley down into Imperial Valley.

I participated in two rather large strikes, and I am not absolutely clear on the dates, but it seems to me that the first one was in November or December of 1933, and the second one was in January or February of 1934.

I cannot even recall the first crop. Anyway, in this period, agricultural work for practical purposes in the field ceased in Imperial Valley for perhaps 2, 2½ to 3 weeks. The going salary or wage was 18 or 20 cents an hour. Whereas our long-range objectives were to conduct ourselves in a way that would build the influence, membership, prestige, and power of the Communist Party, our specific short-range objective was to consolidate this union organization to win some gain, some economic gains, and fortify ourselves for reasons to come. We actually did not get to the point of negotiation in the first strike.

I think we horrified the local people. At this point of looking back I can say understandably.

They one day came to a strike meeting at a garage and hall called Azteca Hall in Brawley, Calif., owned by a man by the name of Maldonado, M-a-l-d-o-n-a-d-o. These Spanish names are all phonetic.

We had at about 10 o'clock in the morning some 1,500 men, women, and children in the hall, organizing the picket lines for the day and organizing the details of our soup kitchen which, to the best of our ability, fed these people, when a group of men, 50 to 75 in number, in civilian clothes, but marked with black armbands, surrounded the hall. There were some officers in uniform present—they pressed into the building.

Sitting in the office we heard the commotion, and I guess they retreated. They later testified in court that they were trying to arrest myself and Dorothy Ray, who was a representative of the Young Communist League and participating in the strike organization. The first we knew of their presence was the sound of tear gas, and this cordon of men we then discovered armed with pickaxe handles—pretty much of a slaughter. As our people tried to escape the building, they were knocked back in, knocked down, and Miss Ray and I escaped through a side window. We went into hiding for 10 days. We were finally flushed out, arrested, tried, sentenced to 6 months for a series of charges, one of them being vagrants. I do not recall the other specific charge.

That ended our immediate participation, and my recollection is that the strike sort of petered out. The men, leadership, drifted back, went somewhere. The trial did not occur, though, until some time in early 1934, maybe March or April, somewhere in there. I am not too sure on that, because it seems to me I got out, actually served 5 months, got out in October 1934.

But in the meantime, while we were out on bail, another influx of union members from the San Joaquin Valley came down, this time to work the lettuce crop, and the organization of that strike was almost spontaneous. We were accepted into leadership by virtue of our previous activity but had to be very circumspect about it. At that time the actual negotiating committee was approached by representatives of the growers and offered some increase, 2½ or 3 cents an hour, something like that, and the State committee of the party, personally represented by Elmer Hanoff, rejected it, which is to say, we were then instructed to instruct our supporters to reject it. This was something of repetition of the previous strike where long lines, perhaps picket lines a mile or two long, circled the fields, and all work ceased, and many of these people were living in what we called in those days, Hoovervilles, just shacks built of canvas, tins, anything, and I cannot say this for sure, but we were told that they were burned out. I did not see it. We were told they were. I accepted it as a fact. It might not be a fact, but we were told that one evening the places were set afire, and I was not even in a position to move around enough, facing a trial myself.

We could not show too much activity, so I never even went up to see whether the place was burned out, and that strike just petered out.

But it must be said that the influence of the Communist Party was very strong in both of these major economic movements in Imperial Valley in that period.

It would be phrased by some that these were completely created Communist activities, but that would be ignoring the vast social forces on the move at that time, and it seems to me that the most significant truth that can be stated is that the Communist Party stepped to the front of this great foment and tried to direct it.

I think we give the Communists too much credit to say that they created it. They studied these developing actions, and they moved to the leadership as best they could, and they kept them going when they would have normally died. So that is the second of the outstanding activities in my mind in that period.

There may have been others that you would consider of some small consequence, but they are not in my mind.

I might say that these people all have changed their names several times. Dorothy Ray was married a couple of times after that, but I guess the name is—

MR. TAVENNER. Will you identify other members of the Communist Party who took an active part in the strikes in Imperial Valley?

MR. HANCOCK. Well, one would be Paul Alexander. I do not recall bringing anyone else from San Diego down there. Dorothy Ray was a member of and representing the Young Communist League. Oh, yes, Emma Cutler was another one. She was from somewhere around Sacramento, pretty well known Communist member.

There was an attorney who came in from Arizona to defend some of the Communists arrested at that period. I would know his name if I heard it. It escapes me now. He was arrested and served time with the rest of us, and it is my impression that he was a party member. Up in my territory he talked like we did and acted like we did.

We recruited local Communists, almost all of Mexican extraction, and the names are just a blur to me. I gave you this name, Maldonado—I connect him with that event—I can give you a name

like Juan Olivas, J-u-a-n O-l-i-v-a-s. I can give you the name of Miguel Guiterrez, M-i-g-u-e-l G-u-i-t-e-r-r-e-z, Sr. and Jr. Junior died.

There are several others that I just do not have the names, and they played no particular important part.

I think it should be said that somewhere along in this period we made contact with the president and the secretary of the American Federation of Labor, Central Labor Council, in El Centro, Calif. There was a later packinghouse strike that brought them into the picture, and I had many meetings with these two people whose names escape, but I later learned on pretty good authority that they were working with us under the direction of some authoritative group, perhaps FBI.

I can only recall that one of them was the motion picture projectionists' representative. I do not remember their names. But they took out membership cards in the party.

There was another fellow, Ed somebody—his name escapes me—who misled us very nicely at that period. He was working for the party and Captain Hines of the Red Squad of Los Angeles—this fellow Burke, Ed Burke—this is going to be something that may interest you.

Ed Burke came to San Diego in this early period as a member of the Communist Party of Los Angeles and with proper credentials, and because his work allegedly consisted of importing birds from Mexico, he was able to offer us a messenger service back and forth. With what we thought due precautions, such as sealing an envelope with a human hair sticking out, when the glue dries, withdrawing the hair, which will tell you whether or not an envelope has been steamed open—that line will disappear. We entrusted messages to him, and I later learned that he was on Captain Hines' payroll in Los Angeles, though he never testified against us. Our relationship was such that he knew quite a bit about the activities we were in. He knew my hiding place when I was trying to avoid arrest.

Now, about 3 years later, somewhere around 1936, 1937—it would be later than that, 1938 or 1939—as the circulation manager for, at that time, the People's World, I made a trip to Los Angeles, and it was the custom at that time to put such people as myself up in the homes of other people. So, for no particular reason I was sent to Steve Nelson's home. Steve Nelson was the party arrested, and I see now, freed in Pittsburgh.

Prior to this overnight stay and discussion with Steve Nelson there had been the Politlabor Committee in California interested in excesses, alleged excesses, of party officials, vigilante officials, and so forth. I was not involved in any of it because by that time I was circulation manager for People's World.

Burke somehow or other called me when I was at the local People's World office and said, after exchanging "hellos" that he was still running back and forth to Mexico, and as representative of the People's World could I give him a letter that he was an authorized correspondent, that it would help him, and so forth.

I was glad to do it for an old friend, told him if he would drop by the next day, I would have it for him.

That night just casually I mentioned it to Steve Nelson. He said, "Whoops, he is a full-fledged representative of Captain Hines."

I said, "Yes? How come? I have been through thick and thin with this fellow down in the valley."

He said, "You sure have, and that is how the authorities got a great deal of their information."

I do not know if Nelson told me outright that the La Follette Committee got this information, but I think that is true, and the record will show there were some leftist lawyers in this group got into police records, and it is my impression, very strong, that a number of names came to light, so this was another Communist Party member who was represented in Imperial Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you at this point to give the committee all the information that you have regarding Steve Nelson's activities. I believe at the time he was the Communist Party organizer for Alameda County.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is not too clear in my mind, but I will give you what I feel that I know. It is my impression that his name came into prominence in the San Francisco Bay area at the time that I was on the People's World, San Francisco office.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you referred to staying in the home of Steve Nelson, was that in San Francisco or Los Angeles?

Mr. HANCOCK. It was in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Steve Nelson's affiliation in Los Angeles, or his function there?

Mr. HANCOCK. I cannot say—I would have to guess at something. For example, people did not walk around with badges, "I am the commissar of defense." In our dealings with them, we realized that they fit into a certain slot in party activity.

Now, in view of the foregoing information, it was quite obvious to me that Steve Nelson was concerned with security matters in Los Angeles. In some way that I cannot at the moment define, he was more concerned with the development of the People's World than any ordinary Communist Party member. That comes about by somebody on a State committee being appointed as the representative to see that this activity is undertaken and pushed, and that campaigns go over, and so forth. So, while no one ever said to me "Steve Nelson is the State committee representative, and so forth," this man in his actions to me quite clearly showed that he was representing the State committee in the interest he showed in the People's World.

I do not think that he was the county president or whatever the title was, but he might have been. He was certainly power behind the scenes.

Now, you know, I wish to heaven I could give you more precise information. You showed me a list the other day that had the name "Decker" on it. There are two Deckers of prominence, one being Caroline Decker, a little girl who was arrested and so on, in the strike activity. The other is a Dr. Decker.

For many months I carried her address and name in my personal papers as a secret contact point with the Communist Party. If I had something ultrasecret that I would not trust to normal channels, I would send it to Dr. Decker.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Dr. Decker would see that it reached its proper destination, is that it?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then Dr. Decker was acting either as a courier or a letter drop?

Mr. HANCOCK. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the Communist Party.

Mr. HANCOCK. You see, there is in the Communist Party a shadow organization for purposes of maintaining secrecy in various matters. Once again you are never told anything specific, but it is my impression that Steve Nelson was involved in this, that Dr. Decker was involved in this, and I can give you another San Francisco name, but I cannot think of anybody—I am talking about Los Angeles now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us confine our testimony at this point to San Diego and Los Angeles.

Can you fix the date of your stay in the home of Steve Nelson in Los Angeles?

Mr. HANCOCK. Only to say that it was probably somewhere in 1938 because I made an overnight trip—which I did about once a month—from San Francisco to Los Angeles to check up on our Los Angeles office, my duties being confined entirely to working out the organizational procedures for People's World.

The best I can do—I am sure it was in 1938 or the early part of 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of contacts with the Communist Party or Communist Party members in Mexico through the use of Ed Burke as a courier. Will you describe more fully, please, the purposes of the Mexico contacts that were made?

Mr. HANCOCK. I will have to make a correction. Ed Burke's value to us was that he went back and forth to Mexico through Imperial Valley. We were concerned with Imperial Valley.

It is true, though, that I stayed at the home of some family in Calexico on the Mexican side—correction, Mexicali, which is the town opposite Calexico on the Mexican border, and I am under the impression that Ed Burke introduced me to this family. We never actually had any organizational contact with the Mexican party members except as they came across the line to work in California, but while Burke allegedly worked in Mexico, it had no significance to us except that it brought him through Imperial Valley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these messages sent to which were carried by Ed Burke?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, they would be sent to our Mexican party members or our party members in Imperial Valley, in Brawley, El Centro.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sent from —

Mr. HANCOCK. Our San Diego office.

Mr. TAVENNER. His work as courier then did not necessarily take him into Mexico?

Mr. HANCOCK. We had no messages for people in Mexico. Although I think I did mention that I attended a meeting of—a labor union meeting in Tia Juana at which Mexican Communist Party members of Mexico were present, but it had nothing to do with Ed Burke, and this party's home where I stayed in Mexicali might or might not be party members. I would be inclined to think they would be, otherwise I would not have stayed there, as a general security precaution. There is nothing in my mind that Ed Burke was instrumental or active in putting us in contact with natives of Mexico, citizens of Mexico.

Mr. TAVENNER. The unrest and the strikes in Imperial Valley and adjacent territory made a very fertile ground for recruiting into the Communist Party, did it not?

Mr. HANCOCK. Everything being equal, it was relatively very fertile. Actually, at no time were hundreds of members recruited into the Communist Party. It was not intended that way. The Communist Party rather carefully would select 1, 2, up to a dozen, set up a unit, and then start working on another unit.

The Communist Party at that time was not a mass organization, and people would be selected on the basis of their leadership capacity, real or inherent.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many cells or units in the Communist Party were set up in Imperial Valley during the period you have described?

Mr. HANCOCK. I do not have it in my mind, but I am inclined to say a couple, and probably confined to Brawley. We probably had 20 or 25 party members recruited from Imperial Valley. It had no whole significance in the activity of the Communist Party because these were in the main uneducated laborers of Mexican extraction, many of whom spoke no English. They read a Mexican weekly newspaper issued by the party, named *Lucha Obrera*, L-u-c-h-a O-b-r-e-r-a. Some party literature came across the Mexican border into Imperial Valley. I remember magazines like *Hoy*, and *El Machete*, the daily organ of the Communist Party of Mexico.

This literature was widely read by the people I am discussing in this particular period, but at the most we had 20 to 25 people who signed a card, and they never actually became our conception of the Communist Party member. They drifted away, and we lost track of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately how many Communist Party members were brought into this area from the outside during the period you have testified about?

Mr. HANCOCK. Oh, at the most at any one given time, at the most, a half a dozen.

Another name comes to mind, Nathaniel Griffin, a colored boy, because a large number of agricultural workers were colored. We brought him—his name is well known in San Diego. He was kind of a mild, passive, not too bright individual, and we brought him down to work on the colored agricultural workers, but that would just about complete the roster.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to say that such a small number as 12 Communists from the outside, with a total of not more than 25 local people recruited into the Communist Party could have and did gain positions of leadership among the agricultural workers in that large area?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, that is completely true. It should be said that such a group could not create something that did not exist. They could stand in the forefront of a moving body and divert its movement, which is what we did.

The impetus came from the deplorable economic conditions of that period. It must be said, too, that what happened in Imperial Valley was a result of similar activities in the San Joaquin Valley just a few months prior, where once again, the same pattern prevailed, Pat Chambers and Caroline Decker being the open Communist members. They built around them a small corps of people, such as I have just

described, and they led pretty large agricultural strikes in that area, and they had people by the thousands who had accepted open Communist leadership who then poured into Imperial Valley, ready and waiting to accept some more Communist leadership.

We found at that time no antagonism nor even antipathy resulting from our known party membership. We were very freely and easily accepted as logical, legitimate, respectable, from their point of view, labor leaders.

Now, I think it might also be said to anyone making a study of this period that another factor, negative, but highly influential at the time, was the complete absence of the American Federation of Labor in this activity, their complete lack of interest in what happened to these poorly paid and long-suffering agricultural workers.

So that we stepped into a vacuum.

MR. TAVENNER. As you look back upon the situation now, what could have been done successfully in that area to have resisted the functioning of the Communist Party?

MR. HANCOCK. A most important thing that should have happened, from the point of view of normal social activities, is that existing labor unions should have undertaken their responsibility and led these people. Their leadership would have been more conservative, more thoughtful, and no doubt more resultful, because while once again it was never stated, the facts are that the Communists conducted themselves in a way that riots occurred, deaths occurred, and while these things finally died down, the furor, the excitement created by them died down, this was not because the Communist Party wanted them to die down. One of the functions of the Communist Party was to keep alive the violent antagonisms that developed from riots and deaths and so forth.

So that I would make the broad statement that first of all the local civic and social leaders were delinquent in their responsibilities. Chief among these were the existing appointed leaders of the American Federation of Labor.

I offer as evidence that when the American Federation of Labor did step in for the packinghouse workers, which are considered the aristocracy of the agricultural workers, the packinghouse workers gladly accepted their leadership, which was a radical leadership, but not one-tenth as radical as the Communist leadership.

The party was able to create dissension, sow strife, win adherence, because for practical purposes the local leaders of society failed in their duties, washed their hands of these dregs of humanity.

MR. TAVENNER. Why was it that later the American Federation of Labor did not measure up to what you conceive to have been their responsibility?

MR. HANCOCK. The American Federation of Labor historically is a craft union. It is an organization of skilled employees. They consider themselves above the unskilled worker. That line of thinking brought into existence the Congress of Industrial Organizations sometime around 1935, when the economic condition in America cried for the organization of large industrial organizations cutting across craft lines, such as came about in the U. A. W., steelworkers' union, and so forth, so that at that time the American Federation of Labor considered it contrary to their normal function.

Later, under the pressure of the existence of the CIO, they broadened their outlook.

For example, while I am not at all clear on this, this was a contradiction that hampered the American Federation of Labor in the aircraft industry, and I just cannot say. It seems to me—yes, I know there is a CIO aircraft union, and under that pressure the American Federation of Labor broadened either officially or unofficially the charter of the IAM, International Association of Machinists.

(Representative Clyde Doyle left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Under the broad interpretation of their charter, they began an association of aircraft workers, but all this finding, if original impetus in the early struggles that I spoke about, where no one of the constituted organizations would have anything to do with these unskilled workers—

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you summarize your testimony and add such further thoughts as you have as to the objectives of the Communist Party in seeking the leadership among employees in Imperial Valley?

Mr. HANCOCK. The long-range objective was to gain control of the agricultural industry of California, of which Imperial Valley was an important part. It was our hope to eventually establish the most rigid control of every agricultural worker in the agricultural areas of California for the still further eventual policy of having large masses of people at the disposal of the Communist Party.

It was our presentation to the agricultural workers, specifically in regard to Imperial Valley, that the landowners were largely absentee owners, that vast profits were made at the expense of the underpaid field laborer, and it would be entirely possible under the leadership of the openly known Communist-led Red unions for the agricultural workers to sharply increase their economic position, their being at all times in party activity two streams of activity; one, to affect as best can be done some economic improvement; secondly, to simultaneously carry on considerable educational activities calculated to move people closer to and into the Communist Party for the eventual purpose of taking over the government.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there occasions within your recollection when the interests of the worker were in conflict with the interests of the party; that is, the Communist Party, which required the Communist Party to decide whether to endeavor to promote the interests of the worker as distinguished from their own peculiar interests and objectives?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I have in mind the one incident that so thoroughly enraged me that it surely marks one of the important, to me, events that eventually permitted me to get out of this activity.

That was the second early 1934 Imperial Valley strike where an offer of settlement was made, and my reaction was to accept it quickly, and I was instructed by Elmer Hanoff that the party was opposed to this settlement, and that we would be required to talk against it.

Carrying out our normal discipline, I did that. A week later the entire structure of the strike was broken down, and no settlement was made.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised as to why the Communist Party was opposed to the settlement?

Mr. HANCOCK. I cannot put my answers on that basis, because this implies a remembrance of conversation. This is an event of 20 years ago. I have to deal with impressions. It is my impression that I understood why the party opposed to the settlement. It is my impression that as of the given moment the settlement was offered, it was the party theory that sufficient momentum had been built up to carry all our objectives to a higher level than would be possible if a settlement was quickly accepted.

For example, had we accepted the settlement, we would have had to fight hot-heads who would have accused us of selling out.

On the other hand, we would have had a gain which meant a condition somewhat an improvement of previous existing conditions. In my estimation this would have given us time for consolidation. I thought mine was the more realistic approach because I had had a taste of the power of the local authorities by then, and it seemed to me we needed a little peace and quiet for careful consolidation.

But I must say that the party action conformed to its general approach to such situations which, namely, is that when, in their terms, a revolutionary situation exists, it must not be beheaded, but should be allowed to continue its course, and its volume of movement or activity should be encouraged, and from the point of view of the State party member, it just made more sense to keep this commotion in existence than shut it off.

Mr. TAVENNER. It continued the favorable opportunities for recruitment and propagandizing?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which would have been broken off by a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, that is true. You might say that in the atmosphere of rigid police restriction of uncertain supply of food for families, of violent passions and excitement, that the party was able to move along toward its aims better than in a calmer atmosphere.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you involved in an incident at Superstitious Mountain in Imperial Valley in which vigilantes played a part?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I was. As a prisoner serving a 6-month sentence in the Imperial County jail, I and several other former strikers were taken to a labor camp commonly called chain labor camp, although no chains were used, out in the desert of California, at the base of Superstitious Mountain for the purpose of breaking up rocks. The activity was rather uneventful until one evening we heard a bugle, we heard voices. We assumed that an attack was to be made on the camp from the shouted threats that we heard.

We posted guards. We collected rocks; we were ready to do or die, and nothing happened, except we lost a little sleep. We had almost unrestricted freedom at this camp, I suspect so that we might escape and not bother the local people any more. In fact, one man did escape, and it worked out to the advantage of the authorities.

He had to go to Mexico and therefore was not in Imperial Valley any more.

The next morning, exercising our freedom, we went up the mountain and found a—I will have to say that a large, fiery cross was

burned the night before, and we went up and examined it, and it seems to me there was a smaller cross with my name on it. I do not remember any open grave. I think somebody stuck a stick in the ground and put a cross on it and put "Hancock" on it.

There was a package all tied up, and in the package was a brass-studded leather knout or cat-o'-nine-tails, a hangman's noose, and a written message which, I guess, was quoted verbatim in the book you just read.

I recall one phrase, "The man who went home yesterday"—Salorcino, his name was Anthony Salorcino—"got his; you will get yours." And it is true. One man was released at his proper time, by the name of Salorcino, and the first night or two he was home his home was invaded, and he was badly beaten.

So nothing further ever came of it, except as a result of this atmosphere, the local authorities were under pressure from—I do not know—anybody who considered themselves of influence, writing and wiring, demanding protection for the prisoners and so forth, and there were considerable indications that as the date of my release grew nearer, that there would be some interference.

The local authorities spirited me out 24 hours ahead of the release date, drove me to San Diego, took me home, and deposited one badly frightened little boy. That is all that happened.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the effect of these vigilante activities upon you and other members of the Communist Party who had been arrested and sentenced in connection with your activities in Imperial Valley?

MR. HANCOCK. Well, the effect was contrary to the effect they desired. The structure of vigilantism is so contrary to American concepts that many people not at all sympathetic with communism were brought very close to us in their active resentment against such activities.

For example, the night I came home it was quite an event in San Diego. The reporters were there. I remember the reporters being violently upset at this series of events and expressing sympathy, which is a gratuitous gain for the Communists when such a condition exists, one which should not be handed so easily to them.

MR. TAVENNER. So in every instance where people take the law into their own hands in their opposition to communism, it is actually playing into the hands of the Communist Party and gives them a propaganda weapon of great value to the Communist Party; is that not true?

MR. HANCOCK. Very decidedly because it is the major tenet of the Communist Party that authority exists for the protection of the well-to-do and entrenched management, and it is their further tenet that when normal authority fails to meet specific needs of entrenched management, they cast it aside; therefore, the workers are justified in doing the same when normal authority does not meet their specific requirements.

It is a beautiful atmosphere for the creation of violence. The bulwark of commonsense or thoughtful action is the existence of authority which allows time for tempers to die down and thought to prevail, and when anyone takes the law in their own hands, especially those claiming to represent the existing order, it requires very little effort to produce an equal action on the part of the opposing side.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it also have the effect of tying the individuals involved more closely to the Communist Party than they otherwise would have been?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, yes and no. Yes and no, but from the long-range point of view of the Communist Party, more decidedly yes. It had the effect of winnowing out those who lacked the stomach for this atmosphere. The weak-kneed people were dropped by the wayside, but those who showed the greatest amount of fight were the ones that we showed the greatest amount of interest in drawing into the Communist Party.

It permitted us to say, "We know how these men will respond in a critical situation because we have seen them in action."

It gave us a power of estimation that might have taken months or years to achieve with equal validity in normal times, and the overall effect was one of bringing closer to us that large segment of the population that calls itself liberal with radical offshoots.

They, in this atmosphere, came more and more to identify themselves with the Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a professional cell or group of the Communist Party in San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. To the best of my recollection we had a group that could be called a professional cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. What professions were represented in that group?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, here again we are on this, in my mind, very cloudy field of memory. I would have to put it this way: We met with a group which, although it might be called professional, also included labor leaders. Some of these people, without any doubt in my mind, were party members. It is even possible they all were. You see, I can't think of them in just terms of existing forever. It was a group that in 1 month some people were not yet involved; at a later time some people had dropped out and others came in.

The original purpose of this group was to win adherence or supporters to the Communist Party policies, and the best way we did that was by actually recruiting them into membership. I remember recruiting some of them into membership myself, such as A. C. Rogers.

I can just see the picture of sitting in his house and talking to him and his signing a card. The same for Johnny Lydick. It is a little vaguer in my mind that "Brick" Garrigues was recruited, but I am advised that he was by his own testimony—by myself.

I just do not have the picture in my mind. There were 4 or 5 others that may have been. It was our desire that they be. We would have worked to bring that about. I think quite possibly they were.

I cannot recall from personal memory this situation, that they actually were card-carrying party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not it was organized as a separate group or cell of the Communist Party? That is, the professional group?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, I would say that it did not function as a normal cell or unit of the Communist Party. There is an organizational procedure of the Communist Party which was not followed in this group.

Specifically, I mean a Communist unit opens its meetings with a reading of minutes—or at least it did at that time. There is a collection of dues. There follows an educational period and the sale of literature. There are communications read from the local office, from the staff office. All these are things calculated to produce an integrated action in the party.

This was not the atmosphere of the professional group I talked about. Its responsibilities, from our point of view, were specific and limited. I cannot recall talking about anything except two major subjects: One, the activities in the Central Labor Council, which was another way of saying activities in the labor unions culminating in the effect our activity had on the Central Labor Council; and the other having to do with some local election activity in which we were interested in getting prominent—what we considered—liberals to run for office. We discussed these things in the group.

I honestly cannot recall any of the other phases of a unit meeting occurring in this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You have previously testified about the setting up of the Communist Party Central Committee under the laws of the State of California.

I show you a statement indicating that certain individuals were appointed to this group by you in the year 1934. Will you examine it, please, and state the circumstances?

Mr. HANCOCK. There is a committee appointed to fulfill legal requirements in California that a political party must name its central committee and must hold a convention in the State capital. The names I submitted were people who could afford to be known openly as Communists, and in no sense was it other than a dummy committee, and it did not conduct the affairs of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe this is a good time to break for lunch.

We will reconvene at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 1:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At 2 p. m., the hearing was reconvened, the following staff member being present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY B. HANCOCK—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities certain data relating to the organization of the State [California] central committee of the Communist Party. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not you can identify the names of any of the persons appearing there as persons known to you to have been members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. The list before me consists of names appointed to the dummy State central committee of the Communist Party, so-called because it was created to meet legal requirements of the California election laws.

I can identify Karl Hama.

Mr. TAVENNER. In identifying these individuals, I would like for you to state as nearly as you can the basis for your identification; that is, how you knew him to be a member of the party.

Mr. HANCOCK. I can identify Karl Hama and his wife, Elaine Black, whom I met in Los Angeles sometime around 1932. They were in charge—or more specifically, Elaine Black was in charge of the International Labor Defense activities in southern California.

Elaine Black's assignment in this activity came from the Communist Party. Karl Hama at that time had a general assignment from the party of working on the Japanese-American population. I first met him at the home of Elaine and Eddie Black, both party members, and later Karl Hama became the husband of Elaine Black.

Bessie A. Keckler was a Communist Party member in our San Diego group.

William H. Bradley, Everett O. Still, and Claude L. Jones were also members of our San Diego party.

Those are all the names I can identify.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you another list of individuals from the files of this committee, indicating the persons appointed to the State central committee for the year 1936. Will you examine that list and state whether or not you can identify any of the persons named there as persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party and the basis of your knowledge?

Mr. HANCOCK. The first party listed, Matt Pellman, was a Young Communist League functionary from Los Angeles, and at one time he was YCL organizer, which was the designation of the person in highest authority in that organization in that community.

I knew and worked with Carroll Barnes, C-a-r-r-o-l-l B-a-r-n-e-s, at a time when he was Communist Party organizer for Alameda County, and I recall attending State meetings in 1934 at which he was present.

Those are all the names I can identify here.

Betty Gannett is known to me or was known to me as State organizational secretary of the Communist Party.

Peter J. Garrison and his wife, Ruth Garrison, I knew as Communist Party members with whom I met in unit meetings while I worked in Alameda County as People's World manager for that area.

The name you have listed as Lucy Kyle no doubt should be Lacey Kyle, a Communist Party member in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell "Kyle"?

Mr. HANCOCK. K-y-l-e. Olefa O'Connor was known to me as a top functionary of the San Francisco section of the Communist Party and a member in some capacity, in my mind at the moment, of the State committee of the party. She was later known as Olefa O'Connor Yates, Y-a-t-e-s.

Pettis Perry from Los Angeles was known to me as a member of the State committee of the Communist Party, and I have in my mind that he was later elected a member of the national committee.

E. L. Saunders, S-a-u-n-d-e-r-s, was known to me as Dave Saunders, a party member from the San Francisco waterfront, and I think a member of the sailors' union.

William Schneiderman was, of course, the State organizer of the Communist Party following Samuel Darcy, D-a-r-c-y, and it seems to me the change took place immediately after the 1935 World Con-

gress of Communist Parties in Moscow, which was attended by Samuel Darcy, and due to some legal difficulties in California he failed to return, causing Schneiderman to be named State Secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. HANCOCK. James Tormey, T-o-r-m-e-y, is in my memory from San Francisco as a Communist Party member, and I recall that he was active in department store union activities.

Everett Still was a Communist member from San Diego.

John Weatherwax, W-e-a-t-h-e-r-w-a-x, was a CP member from Los Angeles.

I think that is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many State conventions of the Communist Party did you attend?

Mr. HANCOCK. I would guess 3 to 5, although it should it stated that I attended many more meetings of the Communist Party of which the State committee had organized, but conventions as such might have been held once a year and sometimes every 2 years.

More commonly we held State committee meetings to which nonmembers such as myself were invited.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, nonmembers of the State committee?

Mr. HANCOCK. State committee, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But nevertheless members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Right. For example, at most times I would have been invited to any meeting of the State committee of the Communist Party, not because I was a member, which to the best of my recollection I was not, but because I was the highest authority of the party in San Diego and Imperial County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any incident in connection with any of the meetings you attended which would throw light on the objectives of the Communist Party in California which would be of interest to this committee?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, none of them stand out in my mind. They represented the various phases of activities we were engaged in, and nothing special occurred there that was not dealt with in our everyday work. I could say that of course at the State committee meetings we received firsthand reports of various activities that held our interest, and the dominating theme of the meetings in the period we are covering was the success of the Communist Party on the waterfront of San Francisco, and to a lesser but considerable degree, San Pedro. This was a major drive of the Communist Party in the years from 1934 to 1936, at which time their strength was consolidated into almost complete control of the leadership of the waterfront organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe at this point the functioning of the Communist Party in acquiring leadership in the waterfront areas?

Mr. HANCOCK. Any information I have in this respect is second-hand, coming from people reporting to the party from these various organizations, but the procedure was one often described as infiltration by a few select individuals who build around themselves close sympathizers, supporters, who are in turn by circumstances brought into party membership, and the classic Communist procedure prevailed of holding fraction meetings, attended mainly by Communist

members, and if non-Communists were present, they were identified as very close supporters of the Communists.

In these fraction meetings decisions would be made to raise various issues on the floor of the union meetings in a way calculated to embarrass or expose the opposition for their do-nothing policies and further calculated to bring Communist Party members or supporters into prominence as the active leaders of the particular group involved.

This procedure could be said to apply to almost any organization at that time, and it was the classic procedure followed in the waterfront unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. What measure of success was attained by the Communist Party in the waterfront area?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think the appropriate word would be "complete," in that Harry Bridges stepped from one position to another until he advanced from chairman of the rank and file committee of the ILA, which led the violent 1934 strike, to actual president of the ILA in San Francisco, and finally to a position of the highest leadership among the west-coast longshoremen, extending his authority from Seattle to San Diego, and then again to the position of CIO regional director for the west coast, all of this at least partially maneuvered by the Communist Party, and all of it being the expression of the Communist Party's activity in this field.

There were other lesser successes in the period. The waterfront activity is the outstanding example of Communist successful infiltration in labor unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a list of individuals who at one time lived in the San Diego area. Will you please examine the list and identify any appearing on it who are known to you to be members of the Communist Party with such identifying information regarding them as you can give?

Mr. HANCOCK. I knew a party named Clair, C-l-a-i-r Aderer, A-d-e-r-e-r, a young lady, I think, from Los Angeles, who became affiliated with our San Diego CP, and it seems to me she was engaged in youth activities.

Ray and Julia Berquist, B-e-r-q-u-i-s-t, were young kids in YCL work. I believe their real name was Whitehead, W-h-i-t-e-h-e-a-d.

Wilmer Breedon, B-r-e-e-d-o-n, was a lawyer who represented the party in many activities, but I don't recall his being a party member.

Mike Delgado, D-e-l-g-a-d-o, and it seems to me he was an agricultural worker from Chula Vista and a member of the party.

Bob Fuller was a YCL member and party member in San Diego. They are all San Diego.

Carroll Hunnewell, H-u-n-n-e-w-e-l-l, was a party member, a member of the cleaners and dyers union and a member of the party committee which issued the mimeographed weekly paper called Trade Union News.

Clarence Jasmagy, J-a-s-m-a-g-y, was a local party member and a piano tuner by profession.

Ben Carron was an old-time party member rerecruited during the time I was active and a chicken farmer somewhere in the La Mesa area.

LeRoy Keckler was the perennial unemployed husband of Bessie Keckler.

Margaret Kerrigan—that LeRoy Keckler, both of whom were San Diego party members.

Margaret Kerrigan was known to me as Margie Kerrigan, wife of Tony Kerrigan, both of whom were local YCL members.

Bert Leech was Los Angeles county chairman of the Communist Party although at another time he no doubt was known as Los Angeles organizer, a different name for the same duties. He came to San Diego on occasion, including occasions when he was seeking relief from his duties in the company of members of the opposite sex.

La Verne and Frances Lym, L-y-m, were active as party members in San Diego in charge of the People's Bookstore after my assignments took me to San Francisco.

Beatrice McDermott, M-c-D-e-r-m-o-t-t, was the wife of James McDermott, and both were party members in the San Diego group. James was for a time active in the aircraft union.

Mrs. Grover Roe, R-o-e, was a rank-and-file member of the San Diego party.

Adrian Ryan, R-y-a-n, who was a YCL member and at one phase a Communist Party member in San Diego.

Paul Alexander, otherwise known as Sterling Campbell Alexander, was a party functionary in San Diego with varying titles, but his influence was approximately equal to mine.

Otto Bensinger, B-e-n-s-i-n-g-e-r, is a name known to me, but I can't recall that person.

The name Bowman, B-o-w-m-a-n, on the list brings to mind a person by the name of Bollman, B-o-l-l-m-a-n, who in 1934-35 was an active party member in unemployment organizations.

Carmen Edwards was a rank-and-file party member.

Lee Gregovich, G-r-e-g-o-v-i-c-h, was a party member in the cooks and waitresses union.

Ed Hollingshead, H-o-l-l-i-n-g-s-h-e-a-d, came into the party in the later days of my connection in San Diego, and he later went to Los Angeles into trade-union activity as a party member.

Margaret Hunnewell is the wife of Carroll Hunnewell, previously identified, and both were party members.

Claude Jones was a party member in East San Diego and a member of the carpenters union which at times made him local delegate to the Central Labor Council.

John Lydick was a party member for a short period and was also a member of the lathers and plasterers union. He later broke with the party and became the appointed secretary of the Central Labor Council, replacing A. C. Rogers.

Cosby, C-o-s-b-y, and Mrs. Newsome, N-e-w-s-o-m-e, were party members with duties largely in the unemployment field.

The name listed, Clarence Wahlenmaier, W-a-h-l-e-n-m-a-i-e-r, brings to mind a Vernon Wahlenmaier, perhaps one and the same, a Communist Party member from the National City area and largely assigned to unemployment work.

Pauline Winston was the wife of a young fellow whose first name escapes me. Even the name Winston is assumed. He came from somewhere in the East and was identified with a family connected with

one of the chocolate empires. These two young people were for a time in charge of the party bookstore.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. HANCOCK. In San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where the bookstore was located?

Mr. HANCOCK. 635 E Street, San Diego. David Wosk, W-o-s-k, was some kind of an engineer and a frequent participant in the meetings of the special group previously identified as being composed of sympathizers and party members. I do not recall that Wosk was an actual party member.

Frank Thibault, T-h-i-b-a-u-l-t, was one of the old guard party members, and for a considerable period he was organizational secretary of the party.

Mike Tosney is a young boy who was in the party around 1932 for a short period.

Rose Volmer, V-o-l-m-e-r, was a party member, but I cannot place her in any special capacity.

Daisy Lee Worcester, W-o-r-c-e-s-t-e-r, was another member of the special group of intellectuals and professionals who appear sympathetic to the currently expressed aims of the party, who attended many meetings at which I was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean meetings of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, meetings of this special group. But I cannot identify her as a party member. That completes the list.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you another list of names of persons living in southern California, and I will ask you to examine the list and give us the names, if any, that you can identify as Communist Party members to your knowledge, with such identifying information regarding them as you are able to give as well as any instances of Communist Party activity which you may now recall.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think Robert Anguis, A-n-g-u-i-s, was the party known to me as Robert White, a person in the Communist Party and in the butchers union.

Arthur Badger was a party member, largely identified with unemployment activities.

Forest Beyrer, B-e-y-r-e-r, was a party member active in organizations that grew out of WPA activity.

William H. Bradley and his wife were YCL and later party members of some prominence in San Diego; that is, prominent in open party activities.

Frances Decker brings to mind a Dr. Decker of Los Angeles not personally known to me as a party member, but known to me as a person who permitted her home to be used as a mail drop for secret party communications.

Joe Langer, L-a-n-g-e-r, was a party member and a member of the International Typographical Union, and he was a member of the small group which published the mimeographed Trade Union News.

Esco L. Richardson was the party member who succeeded me as county chairman of the party.

Dan Taylor, T-a-y-l-o-r, was a party member and was a member of the group which published the Trade Union News.

James E. Toback, T-o-b-a-c-k, was a party member, largely identified with unemployment activities.

John Williams brings to mind a pseudonym used by Pat Chambers, a well-known party member and a strike leader in the San Joaquin Valley during the agricultural foment of 1934 and 1935. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that at the time of your entry into the party that there was a nucleus of persons in San Diego who had been members of the Communist Party in San Diego at an earlier date. Do you recall the names of any of those persons?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I recall Sol Bernhart as the one who would at times tell me about these activities around 1927-28, a time at which I had no contact with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any of the persons in the older group of the party admit former Communist Party membership to you in addition to Sol Bernhardt?

Mr. HANCOCK. I can't recall any others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any information as to why the Communist Party went temporarily out of existence in San Diego prior to the time of your joining it?

Mr. HANCOCK. I was told by Sol Bernhardt that as a result of the Jay Lovestone, L-o-v-e-s-t-o-n-e-Benjamin Gitlow feud with the William Z. Foster supporters, that representatives of the Communist International came to this country, and as a result of their instructions, Communist members who had sympathized with Lovestone and Gitlow had their books picked up, and they were never returned.

I was advised this meant that all the books in San Diego were picked up, and therefore the activities ceased.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member at any time of the American Newspaper Guild?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. While living in California?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. Although it was only nominal membership, all circulation and editorial employees of the People's World were required by contract to be guild members.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was after you took up your work in San Francisco?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. It dated from somewhere around 1938 or 1939 for a year or two, and I think I attended one meeting in which I took no part. Somebody pressured to get an attendance out, but whatever influence the party had in the guild was not represented by open People's World members.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your association with the Newspaper Guild in San Francisco did you learn to know any of its members as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Only my fellow employees from the People's World.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. HANCOCK. Al Richmond, Bertha Wilson, Morrie Smolen, M-o-r-r-i-e S-m-o-l-e-n—there were several others I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Daily People's World in San Francisco an official organ of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir; not so designated in contrast to its predecessor, the Western Worker, which carried on its masthead the title "Official organ of the Communist Party." The Daily People's World ostensibly was the product of leftwingers. In actuality it was completely controlled and dominated by the Communist Party, but it never stated these facts in its columns.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base the statement that this paper was dominated and controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. The many meetings I attended with the State committee of the party at which details of the circulation problems and financial problems of the People's World were reported on, and the solution was discussed. Certainly all the key people on the paper were party members, including the editor, city editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his name?

Mr. HANCOCK. Al Richmond was the city editor. The editor was Harrison George, and the business manager, circulation manager of the regional office. The progress of the People's World was an integral—the discussion of this progress was an integral part of almost every Communist Party meeting on a unit basis, county, and State basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the members of the staff of the Daily People's World assigned to any particular unit or group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Not to any particular unit, although every staff member who was a Communist had to be assigned to a unit. They apparently were various scattered units, and in my particular case the assignment was simply to fulfill party requirements of attending a unit meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean that you were not identified with any particular unit?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, or to put it another way, I was identified with several units over a period of time. One that is in my memory now met in Alameda County because I lived there, but while I was a member of that unit my function on the People's World made it unnecessary for me to participate in unit activities such as they were.

Unit activities means you go out and distribute leaflets door to door and belong to other organizations and so on and so forth. Theoretically everybody has to do this, but if you have a major assignment like I have, it is forgiven.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what assignment Harrison George had in the Communist Party prior his becoming editor of the Daily People's World?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, except his name is identified in my mind with the early party history. I recall, oh, in 1932 or 1933 reading some pamphlets written by him issued by the national office, and I just know him as an oldtime member of the national organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of his activity in a movement to prepare propaganda material for dissemination in Japan?

Mr. HANCOCK. No; I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the group or unit in San Francisco with which you were identified?

Mr. HANCOCK. I really can't recall. We sometimes used number designations, or it might be a regional neighborhood designation, or sometimes it would be a trade-union unit. I can't recall. This one was a neighborhood unit and probably had some name of a neighborhood, but I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify any of the members of that unit?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think at one time this husband and wife combination identified on this list were members, Garretson, Jimmy—I forget his wife's name. I don't have any other names in mind. It was

a neighborhood thing, just to say it was not a special unit engaged in ordinary activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not the Daily People's World was directed by Communist Party leaders other than those who were members of its editorial staff?

Mr. HANCOCK. Most decidedly it was. The editorial and business staff took their directions from certain members of the State committee of the party, specifically William Schneiderman, Betty Gannett, Walter and Rudy Lambert, and Oleta O'Connor are some of the names I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any specific directions which you or other members of the staff received from the high Communist Party functionaries of the State of California Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I can trace my own history, beginning at the point where I was a paid CIO organizer for the UCAPAWA.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the name?

Mr. HANCOCK. United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America. I was called to the State office at 121 Haight Street and, as I recall, was interviewed by William Schneiderman and/or Betty Gannett as to my willingness to take over the Alameda office of the People's World, being informed at that time by the party officials that the CIO activity in which I was engaged was about to cease.

Six months later I was called to the State office and told that I had been selected as State circulation manager of the People's World. In addition, every single financial drive of the People's World, which occurred at least annually, was organized in minute detail in the State committee meetings of the Communist Party, and every single circulation drive in every detail was similarly instituted by that body.

Any important change of personnel had to be checked with whoever happened to be designated as the State representative for the People's World, and there was, it seems to me, complete integration of the party and the organizational structure of the People's World plus its editorial policies.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your connection with the Daily People's World you were identified, as I recall from your previous testimony, with the Western Worker. Will you explain how you became connected with that organ of the Communist Party and give the committee all the information you can regarding its activities?

Mr. HANCOCK. When I left the employment of the San Diego Sun in early 1933, I was advised by State party members, including Mrs. Rudy Lambert—I can't think of the name she goes by—that they would like me to come to San Francisco and work on the Western Worker. I was there for 3 or 4 months, receiving no salary, and receiving no salary I was unable to remain and returned to San Diego.

My activity there was nominally that of circulation manager, but the Western Worker was a weekly paper with almost none of the intricacies of the operation of a daily paper.

That is all I can say about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In the early part of your testimony you mentioned Leo Gallagher as an attorney who defended a number of Communist

Party members involved in the Imperial Valley. A question has arisen as to whether or not Mr. Gallagher was at any time a member of the Communist Party. Do you have any knowledge of his alleged membership?

Mr. HANCOCK. No; I do not. It was the impression among the San Diego party functionaries that he was not a member, and this was deduced in some part from the fact that as a devout Catholic he religiously attended services wherever he was, including the times that he was in San Diego.

In those early days it was not conceivable to us that the party would have accepted his membership with that, from their point of view, important deviation in his personal habits and beliefs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You have described in a general way the reports received at Communist Party meetings in San Francisco regarding the work of the Communist Party in the waterfront section. Did you have any personal contact of your own in Communist Party affairs in that area?

Mr. HANCOCK. Only for a matter of a couple of weeks in 1933, at which time I was working on the Western Worker, and my party unit assignment brought me to the waterfront where I spoke on occasion to longshoremen at Communist-called outdoor rallies.

In 1938 and 1939 I was quite friendly with Dave Saunders, S-a-u-n-d-e-r-s, who was quite prominent personally in party waterfront activities. We had many personal discussions.

Otherwise my information came from reports at State and local committee meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify Communist Party members active in the unions on the waterfront whose names you have not already identified?

Mr. HANCOCK. I think not. While I haven't mentioned it, the names are sprinkled through various hearings, like some guy by the name of Yates married to Oleta O'Connor, prominent in party activities and prominent in waterfront union activities. John Schumacher was a party member; Dave Saunders—the other names escape me—Henry Schmidt, but these names have been rehashed a thousand times. There is nothing I can add to what has been said before.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard a great deal of evidence about the insistence of the Communist Party that its members join various mass organizations or front organizations to carry out the purposes of the party. Did you at the instance of the Communist Party become a member of any such organizations?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; I did, although it should be remembered that as a publicly known Communist my activities were pretty limited in this respect.

However, in the organizational wave which we largely instituted in San Diego, I took out membership through the assistance of Carroll Hunnewell in the Cleaners and Dyers Union and as such conducted an organizational campaign in San Diego that moved along pretty well until some national representative of the union came to one of our meetings, and I was deposed as an open Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you identified him as a member of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. HANCOCK. I have identified him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you run for political office at any time as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I did several times. I don't know that I can even recall the offices.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at one time a candidate for the Board of Education in San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, in 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the circumstances?

Mr. HANCOCK. This was a period where people in large numbers were in need of relief, and there seemed to be no machinery of any consequence to help them. Following rigid laws, the local city government was disconnecting the water supply to various homes for failure to pay bills. We created quite a campaign to put a stop to this situation, and finally, to dramatize the facts we announced publicly that we would start turning the water back on, and I did that in 2 or 3 cases and was arrested and sentenced to 10 days in jail, as I recall, and it was right around that period that an election came up for some local offices, and the party decided to submit my name for board of education which had no significance except to select a position for which we could put our name before the public. Ostensibly while we were electioneering, we were talking about the current aims of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you elected?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an open member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I was. But it should be remembered that while I was an open member, not too many people knew about it because we lacked means of publicity, and this specific activity was carried out by the Unemployed Council, a front organization of the party, so that it would not be quite true to say that everybody that voted for my name voted for a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. What percentage of the vote did you receive?

Mr. HANCOCK. I just don't remember, but the vote electrified the State office of the Communist Party because at that point they had never seen a vote of this size. I can't even remember the total. I think the total I have given you is wrong. It might have been eighteen or twenty thousand, but it was something that was a surprise to everybody, and perhaps 25 percent of what it took to be elected. It was a sizable protest vote, considering that the Communists running as the national candidates of 1932 had perhaps received a hundred votes in San Diego. My vote running into the thousands excited quite a good deal of comment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you later become a candidate for State senator in San Diego?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you running for that office openly as a member of the Communist Party and on the Communist Party ticket?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that race that you made at the instance of the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, I was an official candidate of the Communist Party. It was an open party ticket.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date?

Mr. HANCOCK. 1934.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the strength of the party increase at the time of that election over what it had been before, or did it diminish?

Mr. HANCOCK. I don't think it had any visible effect on the party, although I may be unable to remember, but I have a general impression that electioneering activity didn't serve any important benefit to the party. This might have been because the issues of the day, the electioneering issues of the day, were not exciting. Our most important progress was made in the trade union field on trade union issues. We liked the idea of being able to call ourselves official candidates because after opening a meeting as a candidate, we could talk about anything, but I have no recollection of making any important gains because of that situation.

Mr. TAVENNER. What motivated the Communist Party in putting a slate for election in the field?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, the question is interesting because the record shows that at no time was a Communist candidate ever the recipient of more than a tiny fraction of votes cast. I think there were many reasons, the chief one being that it tended to establish in the minds of the public the fact that the Communist Party was a legitimate, fully legal, political organization with aims and ideals, if not the same as other political parties, within the confines of the normal definition of a political party.

In one sense the political electioneering permitted Communists to come before audiences, not conceivably at their disposal under any other circumstance.

For example, I was given at least once free radio time, and on other occasions had no difficulty in buying radio time during election campaigns. On occasions I was invited to civic meetings on a par with other candidates running for the same office, and all of this tended to create an atmosphere of legitimacy that furthered the interests of the party insofar as they were interested in establishing their legality, which was another way of saying it gave them a cloak for their illegal activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee has heard a great deal of evidence showing that the Communist Party of the United States was being directed and controlled by a foreign power, and from evidence of that type it has been concluded by the committee that the Communist Party of the United States was not a political party in the sense that a political party is known in our system of political science, but on the contrary, is a conspiratorial apparatus which was being used by a foreign power to promote its own foreign policy.

To what extent, if at all, were you aware of such influences within the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, I was aware of the influence. It made itself felt by Communist Party members being constantly propagandized on the virtues of Russia. Party functionaries soon learned that everything that existed in Russia had to be considered good.

In every phase of our activity at least an attempt was made to insert propaganda on the virtues of Russia. In many instances this created ludicrous situations. When, for example, we would be trying to win additional relief for the unemployed, our printed pamphlets would say, "Support the unemployed and defend the Soviet Union." Even

further afield the slogans frequently said, "Defend Soviet China," which at that time meant that portion of China which was under the military domination of the Chinese Red army.

Records will show that in many trade-union meetings and State conventions resolutions were issued by trade-union delegates defending some aspect of Russian activity.

In addition to this, the policy of sending American citizens to Russia and bringing them back as lecturers was extensively carried on.

I recall several young people who purportedly were sent to and from Russia by the, quote, "Friends of the Soviet Union," end quote, and upon their return spoke glowingly at mass meetings around the State of the great things happening in Russia.

This same organization sent adults, who also lectured upon their return, and in the party structure itself it was commonly known that once a year some members in the United States were selected for study in the Lenin Institute, Moscow. So that all in all there was a stream of activity and thought supporting every aspect of whatever line the Soviet Union needed support on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what your knowledge is of underground activities of the party in California?

Mr. HANCOCK. What we termed "underground activities" referred to security measures to protect the party apparatus, and I have some brief knowledge of underground activities which resulted in printed propaganda being placed aboard ships for dissemination aboard. At one point in our San Diego trade-union campaign we received several thousand leaflets written in German, signed by the Communist Party, and our task, which was successfully concluded, was to place them aboard, through the longshoremen's union membership, a ship which happened to be in San Diego in a way that when the cargo hatches were opened, the longshoremen at the point of destination would read the leaflets. This was considered from our point of view illegal and carefully hidden activity.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the ship?

Mr. HANCOCK. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify any other persons who would have knowledge of that activity?

Mr. HANCOCK. It is possible that Lee Gregovich may know. I think Paul Alexander would know.

As I recollect, we produced the desired result through party members getting nonparty longshoremen to do this because we didn't have, at that time, party membership among the longshoremen—just on a friendly basis.

What perhaps should be considered in the field of illegal activity from our point of view was our training and knowledge of coding, clandestine mail drops, preparation of letters and envelopes in a way to guard against their being opened surreptitiously.

Something that stands out in my mind of the many methods passed on to us is the most successful coding method which is simplicity itself. Verbally or by personal courier an agent or party member or party functionary—a party functionary is told to get a certain well-known popular book—for example, *Gone With the Wind*. This title is never written down, and normally the only 2 people that know of its selection is the 1 to send and the 1 to receive the message. The sender has a book of the same title. His message is dictated by the use of nu-

merals. The numerals represent in 1, 2, 3 sequence: 1, page; 2, line down; 3, letter from the left side.

It seems to me this is a foolproof code. I haven't the slightest idea how it could ever be broken, and it was used rarely, and in my experience mostly in practice, but with three numbers representing a single selected letter from any one of thousands of books found in a public library, it seems to me that it is a very good code.

We used other systems when sometimes we suspected people of opening our mail, such as placing heavy black paper around a message and sealing it in an envelope to prevent photography, although I don't know how effective that would be against X-ray.

As previously indicated, we were taught how to seal a letter with a tiny human hair left in the mucilage, and then by extracting it, a tiny line of unglued mucilage remained. In the simple process of steaming open an envelope, this line would disappear.

The party was in those days seemingly fully prepared for the emergency of going completely underground, and it was a part of our regular duties on the higher levels of the party to prepare ourselves for this emergency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any form of Aesopian language used by which one Communist could recognize another without specifically identifying himself?

Mr. HANCOCK. At least on the west coast the terminology was used which permitted Communists to describe party members in the presence of strangers without detection. For example, State headquarters at 121 Haight Street was in public referred to as "the cathedral." Individual party members were identified in conversation as "church members." And that terminology prevailed in such expressions as, "He belongs to the church," and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now able to identify the union of agricultural workers which in the early part of your testimony you were somewhat uncertain of?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, it is in my mind as the Cannery and Agriculture Workers Industrial Union, and I know it by the initials of C. and A. W. I. U.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the early part of your testimony you stated that you left the Communist Party at the time that you left the Daily People's World. You stated that you did not hand in a formal resignation. Will you explain to the committee more fully the circumstances and the method by which you left the Communist Party?

Mr. HANCOCK. I wish I could say that I became disillusioned early in my membership, but the facts are otherwise.

The actual process of disillusionment with me was a tedious, lengthy process.

Beginning sometime around 1936, when I was the object of a violent attack as the San Diego leader by the previously named V. J. Jerome, I realized that I could no longer conscientiously consider myself a full-fledged supporter of the Communist policies.

Something that isn't easy to describe but perhaps should be said is that in the same way that membership in any organization causes

social pressures to be exerted on members to carry out the policies of that organization, the atmosphere of the Communist organization was such that it appeared to be extremely distasteful to leave the organization, distasteful and unpleasant.

For example, the issues of the Western Worker frequently carried articles on the expulsion of this or that Communist, and terms most uncomplimentary were used, so that Communists knew you were either a Communist member or the lowest possible order of human being.

The circumstances of normal relationship with party members made it difficult for me to one day give instructions on Communist policy and the next day deny them myself, so that I took the circuitous course of drifting away from party activity by in 1937 requesting relief from direct organizational assignment with the request that I be permitted to go into trade union work.

That was finally achieved in the latter part of 1937, and when that program expired, instead of going back to me the then distasteful work of party organizational activity, I accepted a further assignment of circulation manager for the People's World.

This was a compromise with myself, and it became increasingly difficult for me to accept even that relationship with the Communist Party.

The greatest impact on my mind came from final reluctant realization that communism was in every practical aspect a complete personal dictatorship. The so-called democratic centralism of the party permitted the members to decide such things as where the next meeting would be held, but all policy decisions originated in small groups of people ostensibly elected, but actually selected by a still smaller and higher group.

For example, the State committee nominees were always passed on by national representatives of the party. Decisions almost never flowed from membership discussion. The membership discussion had to do with implementing the decision, and under no circumstances was the membership permitted to challenge the basic correctness of the decision.

In my slow way the intelligence finally came to me that every hero in the Communist movement was no more than a human being, and mostly in my conception of the role of Stalin as he was presented as almost a party deity, I came to the conclusion that this organization, while it accomplished some good to some people, in the main represented a very terrible threat to society because one man in this whole world had the power to do anything he wished, and right on down the line, one man in the United States could have touched a button to cause Communists to do his personal wishes, and in the State organization one man could have instructed his membership to do his personal wishes, and the thought would come to me, what if this man should suddenly go insane? There is no possible restriction on whatever he may say, for whatever he says becomes absolute law and can only be even mildly questioned at a later time after the action has been committed.

To me the final blow came in the attack on Poland of the Soviet Union and in the issuance of various communiques which reversed overnight the international line of the Communist Party and caused the Communist movement in this country to become blood brothers with the Nazi organization of Germany.

A few months after that event I found a way to quietly leave the party by simply advising State functionaries of the party that since my father had died in recent months, it was necessary for me to provide sufficient income to meet whatever necessities my mother might have, and that I would have to leave that work.

I was called to the State office 2 or 3 times, and attempt was made to prevent me from doing that, but in a very friendly persuasive way. I persisted in the story and in my decision and gave my resignation. Actually the People's World held a going-away party for me, gave me a typewriter, and with that I walked out and began looking for a job in my original profession. Three weeks later I became circulation manager of the Santa Cruz Sentinel News and received in the next year or two one or two letters from Leo Barroway whose name is now introduced for the first time, who was at that time the State organizational secretary, and he insistently urged that I do something about rejuvenating or reestablishing party activities in Santa Cruz. I ignored the letter or letters, and that was my last contact with the party.

I am not proud of this overall activity of mine in the realm of communism. I think some small good was accomplished, but damage of an unknown quantity might well have been done through my influencing others to come into the Communist Party and, for all I know, remain to this day.

I consider communism as something very dangerous, although not imminently so, dangerous in its philosophy to the good and welfare of this country. I think it has without question deteriorated into a simple expression of the aims and policies of the Soviet Union, and as such can bring nothing but evil to this country if it prospers.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

I would like the record to show at this point the closing statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee.

(The statement of Representative Donald L. Jackson (presiding) from the hearing of Wednesday, February 24, 1954, is as follows:

Mr. JACKSON. I personally think, and I am sure that it is the expression of the entire committee and of the Congress of the United States, that in making this appearance here you have rendered signal service to the committee, the Congress and the American people. It is not an easy thing to do, as you yourself have pointed out. But, without any such testimony as you have given here today, the American people would not have the tremendous total knowledge of the operations of the Communist Party that they do have, and because they have it I think that this Nation is probably more alert and more aware to the true nature and significance of the Communist Party than any people on earth. That, I say, is due to testimony such as yours. It would certainly be the hope of the Chair that under no circumstances, irrespective of what may in the future be done with this testimony—and we cannot foresee at the moment what may be necessary to do—but I would certainly express the thought that retaliatory action of any kind taken against you or against any other witness who sees it his obligation to come before the Congress or this committee or any committee to give such testimony; is reprehensive and would destroy the work of this committee more rapidly and more effectively than could the Communist Party itself.

I want to express to you the thanks of the Committee on Un-American Activities for your lucid, comprehensive, and splendid testimony today.

(Whereupon, at 5:00 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)



INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Part 2

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1954

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to notice, at 2:14 p. m., in room 227, Old House Office Building, Hon. Bernard W. Kearney (presiding).

Committee member present: Representative Bernard W. Kearney (presiding).

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. KEARNEY. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that the Honorable Harold H. Velde, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has appointed the Honorable Bernard W. Kearney as a subcommittee of one for the purpose of conducting this hearing.

Mr. Haddock, would you stand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this House Committee on Un-American Activities shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HADDOCK. I do.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would you state your full name for the record, please?

TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN HOLMES HADDOCK

Mr. HADDOCK. Benjamin Holmes Haddock.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the practice of the committee to explain to each witness that he has the right to have counsel during the course of his interrogation and a right to consult counsel at any stage of his testimony whether he has one initially or not.

With that understanding, do you want to proceed now or do you desire to have counsel?

Mr. HADDOCK. It is all right. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Haddock?

¹ Released by the committee.

Mr. HADDOCK. I was born in Coronado, Calif., November 3, 1917.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mr. HADDOCK. I am in the social-work profession; I am chief psychiatric social worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mr. HADDOCK. Montclair, N. J., 836 Mount Bloomfield Avenue.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is your work centered?

Mr. HADDOCK. Plainfield, N. J.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training and background has been, that is, your formal training?

Mr. HADDOCK. I went through the public schools in San Diego and then, following my Army experience, which was just short of 4 years, I went to the New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, in New York City; graduated with a master of science degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of your entrance at Columbia University?

Mr. HADDOCK. It was September 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many years were you in attendance at Columbia?

Mr. HADDOCK. I was through March 31, 1949. It was a 2-year course.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell me, please, whether you served in the Armed Forces during the period of the war?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, I did. I was entered under selective service October 21, 1941, and I was discharged October 5, 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you serve during that period of time?

Mr. HADDOCK. The primary area was the Pacific, headquarters at Hawaii, T. H.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you discharged?

Mr. HADDOCK. October 5, 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you have been employed or how you have been engaged since your release from the Army?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I was sick for a couple of months after I got out of the Army, and I started as a substitute teacher January 16, 1946, and I taught as a substitute for a few months, and then I guess it was for the latter part of April, May, and June, I was a permanent teacher in the San Diego systems.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what school were you teaching?

Mr. HADDOCK. Florence School was the school where I was a permanent teacher. I was a substitute prior to that, so I went to many schools.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that a junior college or a high school?

Mr. HADDOCK. It is an elementary school. I taught the sixth grade.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then after the completion of the year and a half or more of work as a teacher, what did you do?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I worked during the summer of 1947, ran a day camp for one of the local groups, United Jewish Appeal group, and then I came East with my wife to attend the New York School of Social Work. She was a graduate social worker and had 2 semesters or 2 quarters to complete, so we both attended school and she then worked after the 2 quarters and I completed my degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. After the completion of your degree, in what work did you engage?

Mr. HADDOCK. I then secured a job as a psychiatric social worker in the Mental Hygiene Clinic of Union County, Plainfield, N. J. This is a private Community Chest-supported all-purpose clinic.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you are still employed there?

Mr. HADDOCK. I still am there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Haddock, we desire to inquire as to what knowledge you have of Communist Party activities in the San Diego area, and also in New York.

Have you had an opportunity to know at first hand of activities of the Communist Party in those areas?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the basis of your knowledge?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I joined the party in the fall of 1945 and, oh, after a month or two I was accepted, I guess, because then I was notified of where the meetings were to be held, and then I left the party in the fall of 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. You joined the party after you were discharged from the United States Army?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became a member?

Mr. HADDOCK. May we be off the record a minute?

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

Mr. HADDOCK. In answer to your question, I walked into the party office in San Diego and asked for an application form, and signed it. The person who accepted it was Mrs. Lolita Bunyard. Her name now is Gibson. She married after the time of my joining.

Well, I became interested in the Communist Party through men who were in the information and education section of the Army. I had more education than most of the men in my outfit, even though it was only a B. A. and then we went to the Gilbert Islands; I was on that invasion and was stationed there for 8 months following the invasion, so while there they needed someone to do the information and education, which I volunteered to do. There wasn't much else to do, and I also found it quite interesting. There weren't any libraries there.

Well, I might interject here the comment that the person who really gave me the introduction to this was a little fellow named Solomon Kantor, from New York City, who was a subscriber to this little labor paper called In Fact, and he gave me copies of that, and he gave me a book by Seldes, I think, Facts on Fascism, so this was interesting. I don't know how leftist this boy was, but this was certainly the kind of thing that appealed to him, and although most of my activity on Makin was fairly intellectual in terms of presenting factual material and had no leftist tinge, as far as I was able to discern, I had no introduction to anyone who might be described as a real leftist; however, when I got back to Hawaii it was purely by accident that I met a man, whose name I have been trying to think of for the last week, who was in the information and education section of the Antiaircraft Command, and he came in and talked to me one day. I was just about

to take a 5-day pass to Hawaii, that is, the island of Hawaii, and he told me he was organizing a school for officers and enlisted men as a part of the information and education program so that the two groups could be brought closer together so they could function more effectively.

I don't know whether I met him again or not—I may have—but if I did it was in passing, because he was returned to the mainland; but he said, "You come up to the information and education shack; there are several other fellows who meet here whom you will get to know." And sure enough, I was interested; and I met three fellows, one whose name was Martin Mitchnick; another one was Robert Gould—and both of these, incidentally, are from Detroit—and then a third one who I think was like me, sort of excited by this new area, a fellow named Murray Crummins.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he was from?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; I don't. The last time I heard, he was living with his mother in a hotel in New York City, which was used by one of the social organizations that handle refugees when they come in, and I wrote him there to see if I could get in touch with him because I was interested in seeing him again; but he never answered, and I rather got the impression that he didn't want to answer, that he sort of cut the ties; but I made 2 or 3 efforts to get in touch with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell his last name?

Mr. HADDOCK. C-r-u-m-m-i-n-s.

Well, this became a very interesting experience for these fellows. Every Sunday morning we used to go down to the Army-Navy YMCA to a forum that was held by the chaplain—I wish I could remember his name but I can't—a very pleasant man—and this was sort of a current-event forum and it was the self-imposed obligation of this group to, you know, present the right point of view from their point of view or from our point of view.

Another little project that the four of us developed was that we thought it might be good to get some body of information on veterans' organizations, with the hope of influencing the organization that the men went into.

Now, it was the thinking of this group that the organization that should be used by veterans were the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars—I don't know if there was any other—on the assumption that people who were Communists or leftists would be much more effective in large mass organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was before you had become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes. These other fellows were not Communists, but two of them had been, and I think planned to be again, but this is the way party people work. They are supposed to have projects, and this was the project of Robert Gould and Martin Mitchnick, primarily Martin Mitchnick.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know which of the two had been former members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HADDOCK. The two I mentioned, Gould and Mitchnick. This was what they said to me; they were not members at the time. This was something that Martin was doing on his own, I might say. He didn't have any party sanction for it. He was a little bit worried that the party line might be something else, which it did turn out to be, but at least I assumed it was.

You asked me about Jack Hall. One day we went over to Jack Hall's place, and one of his questions was to try to find out from Jack Hall what the leftist thinking was on the question of veterans' organizations, and Jack Hall indicated he didn't know and let it go at that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with Dr. Reinecke on that subject?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; we didn't. I was at his home. I was at his home with Crummins and Mitchnick. I think it was one of these things, "Well, stop in some time," and we did. He used to entertain primarily Merchant Marine men; that is the impression I had. I knew he was a leftist—I knew he was a Marxist, let's put it that way, and I can be more specific. This was why he either quit or was fired from the University of Hawaii. I don't know whether you gentlemen know him or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; he has testified before this committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes, sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not want to disturb too much the order of your statement with regard to the circumstances under which you became a party member. You were telling us about the projects that the four of you had in regard to veterans' organizations, so if you will proceed now as you expected to develop your statement.

Mr. HADDOCK. All right. Well, we wrote voluminously, and got all kinds of replies. That was sort of the end of that, as it were. It occupied our time. I don't know that it was ever used for any purpose.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, does your testimony in that respect mean that through the influence of these two persons who had been members of the Communist Party you were becoming interested in some objectives of the Communist Party?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; that is a good way to put it; yes.

Then about this time there was a move afoot, initially, I think, about some labor leaders in Hawaii—of this I am not sure, however—to organize a labor canteen, and so I became one of those who was active in that group.

Essentially, it was in this group that I met a number of people whom I find are quite prominent in the Communist movement; I didn't know it at the time, although I had, you know, hints of it, certain labor leaders.

Mr. TAVENNER. From Hawaii?

Mr. HADDOCK. They were not Hawaii labor leaders, no; they were mainland.

Well, for example, one of them was David Livingston, who is one of the leaders of Local 65 in New York City. Another was a politician—

Mr. KEARNEY. Local 65 of what, may I ask?

Mr. HADDOCK. I don't know. Let me see if I do know—

Mr. KEARNEY. I mean, is it United Electrical Workers Union, or branch?

Mr. HADDOCK. No; I see what you mean. They are store employees, clerks in department stores.

Then another person who was there, a very mild-mannered West Indian—he was a politician—Ewart Guinier, G-u-i-n-i-e-r, I think.

Mr. KEARNEY. A member of the Labor Party of New York State?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes. You probably have heard the name. This group had quite a push by one of the employees of the Longshoremen's

Union. This was Elinor Kahn, who is their research assistant, and I think she did a great deal to stimulate the activity of some of these soldiers to get this labor canteen into existence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me; what was the name of the person—did you say Elinor Kahn?

Mr. HADDOCK. Kahn, K-a-h-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

Who, in your judgment, were the controlling positions in the organization of the labor canteen in Hawaii?

Let me put the question this way: Do you know from where instruction emanated to organize the canteen?

Mr. HADDOCK. That I don't know, because the 4 of us, this 4 I spoke of earlier, we came in a little late on that. I think this thing had gotten rolling. We sort of came in while it was in its formative stages. I did go out and sell advertising for the booklet which was for their opening day.

As I said, this project just about died, and if it hadn't been for Elinor Kahn I think it probably would have, and, essentially, she mobilized some people, and I really don't know who they were because this was one of the times I didn't get to meet with them. This was a private session. I remember a group did meet with her.

Mr. TAVENNER. In connection with the labor canteen, did you have occasion to meet Alice Hyun?

Mr. HADDOCK. I met her, I know, at least once, and I think she was earning a living making block print blouses at the time, and I was told that she was a Korean revolutionary. Now, that is the extent of it, and I know shortly after—well, I don't know how shortly, but, anyway, she went back to Korea or Japan.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to meet Kimoto?

Mr. HADDOCK. I don't know if I did meet him.

Mr. TAVENNER. McElrath; did you meet McElrath?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; the name is familiar. I don't recall him in my mind's eye.

These names register. I don't know about Kimoto.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any specific knowledge about the connection of the labor canteen with the Communist Party?

Mr. HADDOCK. I could not say that I do specifically because I just don't have the concrete evidence to say it was at this party meeting that such and such was done, because I was never included in any like that.

What would happen, there would be a party in which there was this intermingling of people who, well, you could just tell by the way they talked that they were radicals, and others who were babes in the woods. This was one of the things that struck me; if this was supposed to be so confidential, why did they rope in comparative strangers to some of the things that they did?

For example, this just seems unbelievable, but you remember when the big controversy around Earl Browder developed? Well, I got invited, and I don't know by whom, to attend a dinner where this was presented to the people who were present. I don't know whether it was an officer whose first name was Lee, or whether it was Mitchnick, or I don't even know if Mitchnick was present, but the thing about this that was so dramatic was that out of the 15 or 16 people who were

present, there were at least 3 or 4 that I had never seen before—they were soldiers—and never saw them again, and these were just some fellows somebody brought in.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in Hawaii?

Mr. HADDOCK. In Hawaii, and whenever there was any kind of party discussion such as this, it was always loaded with about a third nonparty people, so it became sort of a group gathering, so you didn't know who were the people who considered themselves Communists even though they were not technically Communists at the time, and you didn't know who were not party members and never had been.

For example, this first meeting I speak of was held at a Chinese restaurant down along, well, I wish I could think of the name of this—I think it is by the Alai Canal. It is that canal which separates the main part of Honolulu from Waikiki. And then the other meeting was held in the home of a fellow named Bristow. I think the name is B-r-i-s-t-o-w. And I remember that the same thing happened in which there was quite a conglomeration of people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, these were things that led up to your joining the party?

Mr. KEARNEY. What is Bristow's business, do you know?

Mr. HADDOCK. Gee, I don't know. I know he married a woman named Mitchell, who was a photographer, professional photographer, and that he divorced his first wife, who had been a secretary to Jack Hall.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right; go ahead.

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, there were many other people and many other factors, but I found that some of the positives and some of the programs that were supported tended to coincide with some of the things I believed in.

For a while during this period I was considering going back to school and taking my graduate studies in religion in order to be a preacher. In fact, one of my very good friends in the Army, Chaplain Fairclough, sent my name in to a number of schools as a possibility. That is Frederick Fairclough, a United Lutheran minister. I think he has a church in Trenton.

Well, I was excited by many of the factors in this group; the comradeship was really the first I had had. I was an enlisted man, fairly well isolated from the population in Hawaii, although I did have a school chum named Peter Ching, and I spent considerable time at his home, which was something I enjoyed very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not indicating by that that there was any influence used upon you by Ching of a Communist character?

Mr. HADDOCK. No, absolutely no. He was not in any way communistic or progressive or radical.

And so this labor group which was also a new group, culturally, to me—I had never met people like this before. I had never even met the variety of backgrounds, European backgrounds, for example, that I found present in this group, and so I believed everything that was said. I had no reason to doubt it.

So, when I got back to San Diego the day after I got out of the service I went down and joined the party, walked right in the door and signed the card.

However, I think I had a reaction after that. I had been offered a job by the unions in Hawaii, so it gives you some idea of how they

felt about me. A fellow named Ralph Vossbrink said that if I wanted to, he would let me join his union and he would put me on a ship and I would come back to San Diego and and spend some time with the folks and then ship back to Hawaii and go to work, I don't know whether for him or Jack Hall's union. I don't know just what the job was, but anyway, the job was offered, sort of, you know, nebulously, and I never did get too serious about it.

Off the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

Mr. HADDOCK. There was another couple who was active in the labor canteen whom I am sure you know. She was a Negro girl who married a white civilian employee in the islands. She was the daughter of the one who owned Trader Vic's. Her name was Smith, I believe; that was her maiden name. But I think she broke with the left side of the fence, because I had heard her criticized by people because she had sort of turned against them.

Does this give you a picture of what led up to it?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes, very interesting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please, just what your experience was in the Communist Party?

I believe it would be better for you to attempt to give the committee as complete a statement as you can, and the committee or I will interpose questions to develop more fully things we think could be developed more fully.

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I joined the party in San Diego and was assigned to the East San Diego branch, and I remained in that branch during my stay in San Diego. I was then transferred to New York City and was affiliated with the student group.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me break in there.

You were transferred, or you were assigned to the East San Diego branch, and while you were a member of that branch did you attend Communist Party meetings there?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; I did.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can you furnish the committee with the names of any party members of that branch?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; I could.

Would you like me to do this, sir?

Mr. KEARNEY. If you would, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest that you describe the type of meetings that were held and what projects there were, if any, in which this particular branch of the Communist Party was engaged.

Mr. HADDOCK. The East San Diego branch was, well, it was composed of family people, I would say, with not too much drive, and actually our projects over the year and a half that I was a member of it consisted of 2 or 3 fund-raising parties, an attempt to get people interested in, I don't know what, but I know leaflets were passed out. I didn't pass them out, but several people in the branch did.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would they be consumers projects or party projects?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think the one that I remember was a consumer project, in terms of bringing prices down——

Mr. KEARNEY. High cost of living?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think that was one of them. In fact, it was right in that period there where the OPA stopped functioning, but there was more than one of them. It was just an attempt to make a showing; it was a very small operation and, as I go over the list of these people's names, not too many of them were really active. Most of them were—they belonged and they paid their dues and came to meetings semiregularly. In fact, some of them here very rarely came to a meeting, on this list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position at any time in the group?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I see I am listed as the educational adviser. I think I was responsible for the educational part of the club meeting, but I took this job from Lloyd Hamlin when he left.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did Lloyd Hamlin hold?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think he was the educational chairman, and then he moved, of course, from our club to become the chairman of the professional group which he organized and was the organizer of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what was the nature of the study groups conducted within your own cell?

Mr. HADDOCK. This will be hard for me to do, but I think that they would consist of such projects as current events, and then we would bring leaflets; our leaflets would be sold to the members, or they would be encouraged to read something. I think when I was educational chairman I was supposed to meet once in a while with the educational chairman for the whole area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the educational chairman?

Mr. HADDOCK. William Reich; and, essentially, the programs came from him and filtered on down to the membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you visited from time to time by functionaries on a higher level who lectured to the group?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I know Bill Reich came once; I don't know if he came more than once; and I think the area chairman would come, George Lohr. I don't know how extensive that was, but I know an attempt was made to do this. You never saw anything like it—well, I guess you have—to try to get the people to do something, to mobilize them—"This is very important." I know once they needed money for something—"Well, we need a day's pay," you know; well, there was always something that had to be done. It never did amount to too much, but it had to be done.

Mr. KEARNEY. What were your dues a month?

Mr. HADDOCK. I don't think they were over \$2.50.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, was that on a dues-paying basis, or was that an assessment, if you made so much you were assessed so much?

Mr. HADDOCK. Your income determined your dues. In other words, the dues were stated. A person with such-and-such an income paid so much a month or so much a week, and you bought stamps to pay for your dues.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed during this period of time, this year and a half while you were in San Diego?

Mr. HADDOCK. I was a schoolteacher in the elementary grades.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you obtain that position?

Mr. HADDOCK. I had a teacher's license and, therefore, I qualified for a position.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the party before you became employed?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; and, to the best of my knowledge, I was the only teacher who was a party member, except Bill Reich, and I think he taught one night-school course a week.

May I say something off the record?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KEARNEY. On the record.

Did you say while you were teaching school that you were the only party member among the teachers?

Mr. HADDOCK. To the best of my knowledge, in San Diego.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, if there were other members of the party who were teaching school in San Diego, wouldn't you have knowledge of it?

Mr. HADDOCK. I would think so. I say that because one of the jobs I got saddled with was raising subscriptions for the People's World, and I remember I visited a number of clubs; I don't know how many, but I remember La Jolla, National City; I may have gone to the Downtown Club. But if there were any teachers in that group, I would have recognized them, and the only basis on which they would be functioning would be on a very, very secret basis, and I never saw a group that kept fewer secrets.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it true that many of the teachers belonged to professional groups of the party instead of neighborhood groups?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, if that were the case—

Mr. TAVENNER. Generally speaking?

Mr. HADDOCK. I would think so, and, as I said, this professional group was organized in San Diego; and if there were any in that, I did not know of it—I mean I would be surprised, let's put it that way. I just couldn't say absolutely there were no other teachers in the system but me, but on the basis of what I know there were not.

I understood, and this again is one of these rumors that you pick up, there was a secret club, but this was businessmen who were not really party members, but the party would use them to get money. In fact, rumor had it that one of the liberals was asked to join this club and he refused.

So this is how I learned about it. I didn't learn about it through party sources, believe it or not. I learned about it through an outside source, and he had been approached by this James Toback, whom I mentioned to you before.

Now, more of the activities, my activities in San Diego. Most of them were in relation to on-club activities. In other words, this was done in the American Veterans' Committee—I know I am going to leave some of these activities out, but my memory doesn't serve me too well—and the housing committee. The main activity was the American Veterans' Committee.

I remember Lloyd Hamlin and I would meet before meetings and talk things over. We sort of caucussed on it, which really is a lousy procedure. I have a lot of personal feeling about this for any group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let's take these separate projects or mass organizations separately and develop, as well as you can, all of the details about the Communist infiltration into them.

Take first the veterans' organization and tell us just how the party went about infiltrating it, to what extent it influenced its actions.

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I wouldn't even call it an infiltration. I would just call it the leaders in the veterans' group were party people.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is, in the American Veterans' Committee?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do I understand you to mean at this time when you say "the veterans' group" the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars?

Mr. HADDOCK. No. That is a good point, because I do not mean that. There were no Communists, to my knowledge, in any other group except the American Veterans' Committee, and how many were in that I just couldn't say, but I know that the fellows our age who were veterans were affiliated with the AVC.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the AVC?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you now a member of it?

Mr. HADDOCK. No.

Mr. KEARNEY. When did you leave the organization?

Mr. HADDOCK. In 1947.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understand they have cleaned house in that organization, haven't they?

Mr. HADDOCK. That is what I understand from just reading the newspapers, and the way things were going at that time.

I think Lloyd Hamlin was a delegate to some meeting up in San Jose, in which you began to see the signs that Communist people were not as strong as they had been. This is just an impression of mine.

If I can just add by just insert here, these projects of the party go by spurts. For example, if the American Veterans' Committee is something that you should belong to or work with, then you work with it, or if it is the Progressive Party, you work with it.

I remember at one point the National Negro Congress was an organization in which the party had quite a stake, or thought they had, and party people were instructed to join it. This was very unsuccessful. Not many party people did, and not many Negroes joined it, and the thing flopped, and I remember within a comparatively short time after that it was sort of wiped off the books as far as the party was concerned.

Now, getting back to these projects. This Lloyd Hamlin and I probably worked closer together than anyone else in the party. He was the first party person I met besides Mrs. Gibson, and for a few weeks I didn't realize he was a party person. It wasn't until I met him at my club meeting that I realized he was a member of the party, but he and I worked hand in glove in the American Veterans' Committee, and, essentially, any of the counsels from the top office of the party were usually communicated through him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the exact source of the counsels that came from the head of the party to him?

Mr. HADDOCK. No, but I think Lloyd, after he became the chairman of this professional group, was then promoted, you see, into the executive committee of the county, so he would then be in a position to know what was going on at the top level.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee how you first met Hamlin?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, Lloyd Hamlin was acting as a secretary or some functionary for the Spanish Refugee Appeal—I think that is correct—and Dr. Steinmetz was the one who suggested I meet Lloyd, since Lloyd and he were both interested in the project, and so I met Lloyd. I don't know why I went to see him, but it may have been around the veterans, because I know he was active in the veterans at that time, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with Dr. Steinmetz?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; I knew Dr. Steinmetz. I met him after the war. I talked with him several times. I have been in his home a few times.

Mr. KEARNEY. Was he a member of the party?

Mr. HADDOCK. To the best of my knowledge, he was not. He made quite a point of keeping his skirts clean. He was a very nervous person in terms of getting caught. He certainly didn't seem to be bothered by talking and working with people who were party members. I think that is the best way to put it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he suggest that you meet this man Hamlin?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; and I think the reason he did was because it was going to be through him and Hamlin that I was going to meet Colonel Carlson.

I had a reason for meeting Colonel Carlson, by the way. When I was in the Gilbert Islands I went to one of the outlying atolls, called Little Makin, and met a Protestant minister there trained by the London Missionary Society. His name was Korenorio. He wanted me to hear a story.

The story was that he had preached one Sunday for peace and word of this had gotten back to the Japanese on the main island of Butaritari, and so they had come and arrested him and his assistant minister and placed them in pail on Butaritari.

Well, it was while they were in jail that Colonel Carlson and his raiders raided Makin, and it was epitomized in this movie, Gung Ho, and so they saw these two natives and caught them, and so these two Protestant ministers acted as a guide to Colonel Carlson's raid on Makin, and this was the story he had to tell, and it was a very interesting circumstance that I should land in San Diego and within a few days of my arrival be able to see Colonel Carlson and tell him this story which he read.

So this was a personal interest I had in meeting him, beyond the fact that he was going to run for Senator, and there was a possibility of my getting a job working for him.

Mr. KEARNEY. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KEARNEY. On the record.

Mr. HADDOCK. Colonel Carlson's name was Evans Carlson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you describe in a general way to the committee, please, the type of activity that this veterans' organization engaged in?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, as best I can remember, it was on current issues. I know housing seemed to play an important part, since that was one of the major problems in San Diego, and I think I was the vice president of the American Veterans' Committee at the time, and I was appointed to chair the citizens' housing committee, which

I did, and we organized what turned out to be a very sound committee, and I was the only Communist on that committee.

At some of the organizational meetings there were a number of people, Communists, present; there were, also, quite a wide variety of interested people because the purpose of the committee was to get more housing, get more public housing, and this was opposed by certain real-estate interests in town, so they were very interested in the influence the committee might have. We really organized what I think, as I remember, was a fairly broad board, and they acted as an advisory committee to San Diego, and the last time I heard they were still in existence, and after I left it there were no other Communists on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In performing your functions as chairman of that group, did you receive directives of any character from the Communist Party as to the program that you should follow or the methods that should be used in carrying out the objectives of the group?

Mr. HADDOCK. I would hate to answer that either yes or no, because you know some directives can be tacit, and this had been rehashed, this whole thing had been hashed and rehashed by Lloyd and me, and I had a pretty clear focus in my mind as to what the program should be; I don't remember what it was, but I don't think that it varied at all from what the general party line might have been.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think I will have to leave now. Thank you very much for coming down and giving your complete story here. It is of immense value to the committee. I know that I express the thanks of counsel and the committee, too.

(At this point Representative Bernard W. Kearney left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general nature of the secret meetings held by you and Hamlin regarding the proposals to be followed in any of these organizations which you have spoken of?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, sometimes we would meet before an AVC meeting, or we might even talk on the telephone. How much of this we did I don't know. I think my line was tapped for the entire period I was a party member. But I do know that we worked pretty close, hand in glove, on this business.

Perhaps the other project that was even more significant as a community project was the formation of the PAC in San Diego, and then a group met with some nonparty people present and told them what we wanted to do, and we talked over the steps of getting this committee into action, and I was selected to chair the first meeting, I think, and I know I chaired the second meeting, and it was at the second meeting that the PAC, which was the forerunner of the Progressive Party, came into being. This was a very carefully planned operation, and the point was that this was going to be a Progressive Party; it was not going to be an extension of the Communist Party even though the Communists were going to have the right to play an important role in it, but at the organizational meeting I was nominated for chairman, which I had to decline because I was leaving San Diego, and another person was nominated.

This man, who represented a middle-of-the-road, liberal outlook, was nominated, and then some adolescent in the audience nominated a man from Linda Vista named Rogers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember his first name?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think it was C. A., and that is probably correct.

Now, this man was known locally as—put Red in quotes, because he always identified himself with leftist activity and minority problems, and he had been one of the group that had sat in on the initial planning for this meeting, but he did not decline, and he was elected, which I knew and Lloyd Hamlin knew sealed the doom of this ever being any kind of a broad, progressive group. I might add that Lloyd and I only expressed this opinion once or twice, and we got an official reprimand from the party for not following the will of the majority which elected Rogers to the presidency of this group. It so happens we were right, though.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it was the basic plan of the party to use liberals in positions of prominence in these organizations rather than men closely identified with the Communist Party?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, that is correct.

Well, I left San Diego at this time and I probably have left out numerous things, but this is a general outline, very general, of my work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give me more definite information as to when the professional group or unit of the Communist Party was formed in San Diego?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think it was formed in the spring of 1947, and if it were earlier it would only have been by 2 or 3 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn the identity of any of its members?

Mr. HADDOCK. I could guess on some of them. I know you would rather not.

I don't think I was ever at one of their meetings. If I was, it wasn't for a full meeting; it was only for a partial one, and I would rather not state—but I can say that most of them were not professionals, which is an interesting contradiction. There were a couple of labor people in it; there was a woman who later became active in the PAC, a writer, a businessman.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I put the matter this way:

It would be of importance to the committee as lead information only, and not at any time to be made the subject of public release, the names of these persons that you think were members, which is entirely a different thing from identifying them as members of that group, but purely as a basis for further investigation on our part.

In other words, I am asking you for this purpose of lead information only to give us the benefit of any hearsay testimony that you have.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. HADDOCK. It is A. C. Rogers, I see here. It is not the other way around. I believe he is one. Ray Morkowski, Lynn Ackerstein, Jeff Boehm.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, can you identify them a little more definitely as to which is a writer and which is a member of the union, and so on?

Mr. HADDOCK. Rogers is a businessman; Morkowski is a labor leader; Boehm is a writer. I think Jack O'Brien was one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify them more fully as to occupation?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think Jack worked for the union. He had some kind of cerebral palsy, I believe.

Dave Buchanan, he was a labor leader.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

Was there any other organizational work that you undertook in behalf of the Communist Party while in San Diego?

Mr. HADDOCK. I may have, but I do not remember it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any effort made to recruit members to the Communist Party from the teaching profession, to your knowledge?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I was urged to recruit, but I made no effort to recruit from the teaching profession because I knew no one that I would feel was susceptible to party membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you get your directions in that respect?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, this would be at a club meeting.

"We have got to do something to increase membership. There has got to be more recruiting done. Look here, you come to meetings every week"—or every month, or whenever it was—"and it is the same gang; no effort to recruit."

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you identify at this place in your testimony the names of all persons known to you to be members of the East San Diego Branch of the Communist Party of which you were a member, and in so identifying these individuals would you give us all of the identifying information you can with respect to their professions or occupations and any particular activity that you can recall on their part in the Communist Party?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

Joe Langer, I think, was a bachelor and was a workingman. He was very regular in his attendance at party meetings, but I didn't see him other than at the party meetings and, also, occasionally the party would run seminars on Sunday down at Bill Reich's farm down in one of the rural areas of San Diego, and he would go to that.

Margaret Gartz was a nice and simple woman, who was secretary, but not too much color. She was a person that, again, was never in anything that I was in, outside of East San Diego and there Sunday seminars and picnics.

Now, Nathan and Millie Herman were a young couple who came from a working class background and were party members and very faithful. He was a elevator operator at the U. S. Grant Hotel.

Mrs. Lillian Hunt was the chairman of the East San Diego group while I was a member.

Mr. and Mrs. Crosby Newsome were members but never active in any other organization that I was affiliated with.

Leo Gregovich was the Yugoslavian who owned the Track Restaurant, and I think another one in San Diego, and he was active in the Yugoslav group and in the Cooks' and Waitresses' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that, do you mean to identify them also as a member of this Communist Party group?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes. Yes, Lee Gregovich was a member of the East San Diego Branch of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the basis for your statement that he was a member?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, he came to the meetings and was active in organizational work. In fact, he was more active than anybody else in the club, frankly. He would pay kids to pass leaflets out, and he would even do it himself.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. HADDOCK. Now, Mary Arabian was very, very rarely active. She would come to meetings once in a great while, and she put on a big party for the party, which I didn't go to, but I think in planning for the party was the first time I ever knew she was a member of the club, and this was toward the middle of 1947, but evidently she had been for a long time and I just didn't know it—one of those circumstances.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you subsequently meet her in Communist Party meetings?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think she came to 1 or 2, yes. If she came to more than that my memory has failed me.

Bob Watrous was a watchmaker in East San Diego and had been active in his watchmen's union for a number of years. He was a person that was really on the verge of severing his Communist Party ties. It was too much of a strain for him that he was under.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me say at this point, if any of the persons whom you have already identified or will identify later did break with the party, to your knowledge, I would like for you to so state.

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

Jack Bennett, I think, was an employee of an aircraft company in San Diego, but he came to meetings for not too long a time. I think I am right on that. My impression is that he left the party, but again this is an impression, but I can be definite as to having seen him at the East San Diego Branch, of which he was a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated in the early part of your testimony that you were active in subscription work for the Daily People's World.

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you undertook that work?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I was asked by county leadership to take this as an assignment, which required that I go to the various clubs and tell them the story about the People's World and encourage them to get subscriptions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of county functionaries who gave you directions in that regard?

Mr. HADDOCK. No, I can't. I don't know how I got the information.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you engage in that type of work, and over what period?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think it was in 1947, and I don't know that it lasted more than the month. It may have.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many different groups or cells of the Communist Party did you come in contact with in the performance of that work?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I think I came in contact with the La Jolla Club and the National City Club, East San Diego Branch Club. I don't think of any others.

Did I mention one to you a little while ago?

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

What occasion did you have besides doing work of that type to become acquainted with other members of the Communist Party in the greater San Diego area?

MR. HADDOCK. Well, there was one occasion when I was asked by George Lohr to go down to National City about an incident where a Negro boy had been hurt, and it was the feeling that there might have been an issue involved here which the party could take action on, and I went to National City with George Lohr and David Buchanan, and I think we met in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Dugdale to talk it over. The consensus was that there was no basis for any kind of action, so the thing was dropped.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you meet with clubs other than your home club on any other occasions besides those you have described?

MR. HADDOCK. I may have met briefly with the professional club, but of this I am not sure.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names, please, and all the identifying information you can regarding the Communist Party membership of any other persons other than those you have already named where you have direct knowledge of your own, indicating Communist Party membership?

MR. HADDOCK. Richard Adams, who was the first party functionary to come to me and get me to sign the application card for my 1946 membership. I was sick at the time, and so he came to my home. I had never seen him before, and he later ran for office in National City and was elected.

MR. TAVENNER. What office?

MR. HADDOCK. I don't know. I think it was councilman.

MR. TAVENNER. Did he run on the Communist Party ticket?

MR. HADDOCK. No; he ran on some community ticket, and he later was caught accepting a bribe and was expelled from the party.

MR. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. HADDOCK. Well, Jeff Boehm is the writer who had been fired by the San Diego—

Do you remember Clifford McKinnon, who was a Representative a few years ago?

MR. TAVENNER. I remember the name.

MR. HADDOCK. Do you remember the paper he owned?

MR. TAVENNER. No.

MR. HADDOCK. Well, Jeff Boehm worked for his paper, and he was fired by McKinnon.

MR. TAVENNER. All right.

MR. HADDOCK. And David and Lucia Buchanan—

MR. TAVENNER. Off the record a minute.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. TAVENNER. Go ahead.

MR. HADDOCK. Mr. and Mrs. David Buchanan.

MR. TAVENNER. What position did Buchanan hold in the party?

MR. HADDOCK. I don't know that he held any position.

Now, Lucia has visited our East San Diego Branch meeting, but why she came I don't know, but she came for some reason. I remember she brought a fairly newborn baby along that slept very well in the other room—a very lovely girl, and she appeared quite devoted to the goals of the Communist Party.

Lolita Bunyard Gibson was practically an open Communist. She was the daughter of a Unitarian minister.

William Conway and Mrs. Conway—

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give her first name?

Mr. HADDOCK. No, I can't.

He had been a party member for many years and had been on the books of the east San Diego branch, but never came to meetings, and during the end of my stay there he started coming again. He was a very retiring, pleasant fellow to whom personal relationships meant a great deal. I remember he was one of the few people in the party that came to me when I was leaving to go to school and made, you know, real personal mention of what it had meant to know me, and that he hoped some time he would meet me again. Whether these people ever continued in the party or not—my suspicion is that Bill Conway probably dropped out. I don't know what he did for a living. I know he was an inventor on the side, one of these inventors who never make any money off of their inventions.

Enos Baker, Jr., I obviously know. He was the organizer that succeeded George Lohr, and was organizer when I left San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On the record.

Mr. HADDOCK. Enos Baker was a Negro, and how long he stayed a party leader I don't know; it seems as though it wasn't very long.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me suggest this to you: When you are naming these persons, if they attended Communist meetings at which you were present, I believe each time you ought to say so.

Mr. HADDOCK. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this true in this last instance?

Mr. HADDOCK. I believe that is true. I don't remember any specifically, but he was the party organizer, and it was well known, so there is no question.

Lloyd Hamlin was a party member in the east San Diego branch. As I have indicated earlier, he was my main liaison to party leadership. He was a member of Naval Intelligence.

Harry Hunt was the husband of Lillian Hunt, and he has sat in on some of the meetings of the east San Diego branch, but during most of the period that I was a party member he was not, since he had been expelled for being too highhanded, I think is the best term. He became a little dictatorial in his handling of membership.

Now, William Reich, I have already mentioned in this testimony, and he was a party member and left San Diego prior to me to take a job as editor of some newspaper up in the Oakland area.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you at this point, who were connected with the Daily People's World with whom you dealt that were known to you to be members of the Communist Party, if any?

Mr. HADDOCK. You know, there must have been someone on the county level that I passed this material through, but I can't think who it was. Your question reminds me of this. I know there was someone, now. I don't know who it is.

Now, Nancy Rosenfield was a party member. She was a party functionary.

Harry and Cecelia Shermis—he was a contractor, and I think she was the county treasurer of the county organization, but I think we have held a meeting in their home, which is in La Mesa, or a party, but I do remember them.

James Toback was known as a Communist, and would say so to people, though I have never seen him at an exclusively party meeting and he was not in my club.

I can't think of any others in the San Diego group.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon, at 3:58 p. m. a recess was taken, after which the hearing was resumed at 4:05 p. m.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee, please, whether the Communist Party was successful during the period you were in San Diego in carrying out its objectives within the field of mass organization?

Mr. HADDOCK. I do not feel it was effective in any of its activities, and the main reason seemed to be that it was unable to provide the kind of leadership to which people responded. There was a lot of conviction, in intensity, on the part of Communists in relation to the programs they espoused, but they didn't have ties of sufficient strength to have many followers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had the party been successful in recruiting membership in a broad enough field it would have been more effective in its operations, would it not?

Mr. HADDOCK. That is a good way of stating it, and I think it implies that the doctrine of the party was so narrow that they didn't open the doors wide enough to let people in.

It is like a strict religious group whose tenets you have to follow in detail or they don't want you to belong.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was disciplinary action of any kind resorted to within your knowledge or any methods of compulsion used in preventing deviation from the Communist Party line?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, the only disciplinary action that I can recall was administered by George Lohr to Lloyd Hamlin and me for our opinion at the election of A. C. Rogers to be chairman of the political action committee, that it was an error.

There may have been other instances, but they are not vivid enough for me to remember, mostly verbal haranguing, and I might add that Mrs. Lillian Hunt, who was the chairman of the east San Diego branch, was quite an orally aggressive woman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for your leaving San Diego and going to New York?

Mr. HADDOCK. I wanted to do graduate work in social work, and the reason for this was that while teaching in San Diego city schools my classroom was right next to the mental hygiene clinic, and another reason was that I met several social workers during the war, and I met several in San Diego, and then I married one.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you entered Columbia University did you continue in any Communist Party activities?

Mr. HADDOCK. My membership was transferred to New York City—and then I was—it filtered down to the—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take the initiative in having your membership transferred?

Mr. HADDOCK. I would say it was half and half. I made no effort not to have it transferred because I wasn't ready at that point to leave the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it the practice and custom of the party when a member moves from one locality to another to take the initiative in the original place of membership and cause the transfer to be made?

Mr. HADDOCK. To the best of my knowledge, it is; yes. In fact, they came to my house, Nancy Rosenfield, and I forget who else was with her, and made out the transfer slip right there at the time they did it.

Mr. TAVENNER. With what group did you affiliate in New York?

Mr. HADDOCK. A student group within the New York School of Social Work.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is a branch of Columbia University?

Mr. HADDOCK. It is an independent school which has become affiliated, and we get our degrees from Columbia. But the school doesn't get any money or administration from Columbia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, about the activities of that group?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, this group was composed only of student social workers or social workers in training, and this was a much more active club than the east San Diego branch, had more experienced leadership and more experienced members.

The main responsibility of this club was in the Student Social Service Employees' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did the Communist Party seek to achieve through the organization of a cell within the student body at that school?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, from as near as I could gather, to encourage social work students to join the Social Service Employees' Union, which, in itself, would give union indoctrination and party-line thinking, since it was my understanding that this was a party-led union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did members of that group join that union?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes, to the best of my knowledge, we all did, and this was one of their party responsibilities, that they go to their party meeting and then go to the union meetings and take leadership roles in it.

Now, at the first meeting of the club that I attended I was asked what I would like to do. I found at this meeting that the members of the club were people who had been Communists for some time, and just the way that that question was phrased was a new concept to me, since the party discipline and leadership had not been this astute on the West Coast.

Well, the leader, who was Jesse Nemiso, suggested that I might want to work in the student council, since there was an opening for a representative from the labor unions group on the student council. I was just appointed by him, and then my appointment was presented to the executive council of the union.

I worked on the student council for 5 out of my 6 quarters at school. From this time on I think I only went to 1 or 2 union meetings, and my whole time was devoted to student council work.

I also commuted from Orangeburg, N. Y., where I lived in Shanks Village, which was a veterans' housing project, so I didn't have time for too much activity. I found the party work in New York an emotional strain. I couldn't put my finger on it, but I felt under pressure. Actually, I think I did a minimum, even getting out of party meetings when I could, but I did a good job in the student

council and I was elected president of the student council in May or June of 1948 and served two quarters, my term expiring in December.

During that period I was also on the student faculty committee, which was responsible to the students for working out a problem which had resulted because of some hasty action by the student council of the previous semester.

The president of the student council at that time, Mr. Ray Lerner, also a party member, decided to transfer a strike protesting a raise in tuition from the front of the school itself and, on the lunch hour, to a fiftieth anniversary luncheon in front of one of the leading hotels in New York City. The Social Service Employees' Union participated in this demonstration, provided the placards, and even sent people to walk on the picket line, and this action, justifiably, resulted in terrific hostility toward the student government.

Well, it was following this that I was elected to be the chairman of the council, and it was 2 or 3 days after I was elected that a meeting was called to discuss this proposal of the school, and I was given about 6 hours' notification on it. I heard of it, but I didn't say anything to anybody until suppertime, and then I met with party leaders in our club, and was severely reprimanded for not letting them know earlier. Their hope was that had they known, they could then have presented the students' side of this controversy.

Dean Margaret Leo announced at this meeting, to which all school students were invited, that the school government would have to prepare a new constitution and that this constitution would be subject to faculty approval. At that meeting I felt it was my obligation to stand up and speak to the dean's remarks, which I did, and the main content was that I felt that this was a hasty action on the part of the faculty and that I hoped that the students would be permitted to organize their own government, so for the two quarters of my term I was the leader of a divided student council and in constant negotiation with the faculty, and I might say that the students' side, which I attempted to broaden so that we had a good committee, broad committee to represent the students, did not help the matter, and I think that this is understandable in view of the fact that the faculty had had its sensibility so outraged by the student action that they just could not relate to us.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent was the Communist Party responsible for the action in transferring the picket line to the hotel where the 50th anniversary luncheon of the school was being celebrated?

Mr. HADDOCK. I don't know that they had any part in that. If they did, I didn't know about it, and I am sure I would have. But it was done very hastily.

I may have been consulted as one of the members of the student council, but this is one of the kind of things I like to forget, that I might have been consulted, but I may have been, so I would share the responsibility for this. It was a verbal O. K., and the whole student council was not consulted.

At the end of my term, in fact before the end of my term, I sat down with the leader of the club, Jesse Nemiso, and I told him that I was finding party membership too great a strain, I just couldn't take it, and that I was going to have to get out. I didn't tell him that I was getting out on any theoretical break with the party. I told him it was too much of an emotional strain, which it was.

The only thing that did bother me about the club activity was some of the blind following that was done by the party. For example, when Yugoslavia's leader objected to some of the thinking of the Soviet Union, Tito immediately became the subject of party hostility; he was no good any more. From my point of view, why shouldn't he? He could say what he wanted. He was the leader of his own country, and if he wanted to express an opinion that was contrary to some Joe Blow up in Poland or some place else, I didn't see that this was reason for, you know, kicking him out, but this was literally, slavishly followed by most of the leadership, and I voiced my opinion on it and they gave me all the chance to discuss it, and so on, but one of the things that happened in the party is that they have a big, long period for discussion, but after the discussion and a decision is made, you know, you keep quiet.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have the feeling that the decision had been reached before the discussion?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, there wasn't anybody objecting to this point of view, let's put it that way. The decision came through some Communist national newspaper in Poland.

There was also a couple in the club, not a married couple, whose names I don't remember; one was a Syrian girl, I do know. They became quite provocative in the meetings, and these two people were eventually expelled.

I know there was another girl in the party who, on the basis of this, resigned from the party. She didn't go along with this action. Her name I don't remember, either, and then I think she left the party after I did, but I heard that this had happened, and I know she was very dissatisfied with this expulsion.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many members were in the group of the Communist Party organized at this branch of Columbia University?

Mr. HADDOCK. Oh, I would say about 15. There may have been more than that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have given the name of the leader of the group. Will you give us the names of any others that you can now recall?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, his wife was a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know her name?

Mr. HADDOCK. Only as Mrs. Nemi. And Mollie Eisenstadt, E-i-s-e-n-s-t-a-d-t, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give me any information as to where either or any of these persons are now?

Mr. HADDOCK. I think they are all in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what fields?

Mr. HADDOCK. All in social work. And I can't remember any others—and the other one I already mentioned, Ray Lerner.

It is kind of funny, too, because this is the group I should have known better than I did, but I forgot them very quickly, and I haven't had contact with any of them since.

You might be interested, following my resignation, Ray Lerner then became chairman of the club, and he asked me to go out to lunch with him, and he told me—

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "chairman of the club"?

Mr. HADDOCK. Well, I think maybe the technical word is organizer. He is the president of the club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Communist club?

Mr. HADDOCK. Of the Communist club, yes.

We went out to lunch together—he didn't take me out to lunch, but we went out to lunch together and he told me he was sorry I had left the party. He said he was in the party because he felt this was the best way to fight fascism, which he felt was a real threat to America, and I said to him that he might be right, but I really didn't think so, and, essentially, that is the way we parted, and that was the end of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been approached since that time to rejoin the party?

Mr. HADDOCK. I never have, no. I might have been if I stayed in New York and worked, because then I would be in contact with people who knew that I had been a party member, but out in New Jersey I don't think there would be anybody who would have those kind of lines.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you joined any other mass organizations or front organizations besides those you have already mentioned?

Mr. HADDOCK. You mean during the period I was a Communist?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HADDOCK. The answer is "Yes," but I can't give you the names. I am sure I have, you know, one of these things in which you subscribe to something and you become a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or a sponsor?

Mr. HADDOCK. I don't know that I was ever a sponsor. I didn't join any of these groups since I left San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any type of Communist Party activity since you resigned from the party in 1948?

Mr. HADDOCK. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has your severance of your connections been full and complete?

Mr. HADDOCK. Yes; they have been. As I indicated, the only person that I had any contact with—and I didn't realize he was a Communist—was Ralph Vossbrink, and I sent him a Christmas card.

When I went to San Diego 3 years ago I didn't even look up any of the party people that I knew. If I met any others they were party members at that time and I didn't know about them. I didn't even look up Lloyd Hamlin, even though I like him very much.

I figured well, I am no longer in the party and I just wouldn't feel particularly comfortable, because I would have told him that I had left the party. I figured he might give me an argument or something, and I didn't see any reason to defend myself. It was my choice. I went in of my free will and, as far as I could see, I didn't have to justify my leaving to him or anybody else.

I think my convictions about the party have become more crystallized as time has elapsed. I have had a better perspective on it. It was a very intense emotional experience for me. I gave a lot of time; I was out 4 or 5 evenings a week. That is why I was in a lot of activity that I can't remember, and I can't say that I accomplished one thing, not a thing. It is very sad but it is the truth.

There is another thing about the party that perhaps bothers me as much as anything else, that there doesn't seem to be any continuing relationship with people who are party people, as people, if you don't believe what they believe, and that is not right. When this exists there is something very haywire with the people who hold this point of view.

After I left the party, for example, the people that I knew, I sent them Christmas cards. I got one back from Lloyd. So I figured, well, if this is the way they really feel maybe this is—and the people in Hawaii are the same way, you know, out of sight, out of mind, that kind of thing. There is something wrong with that. It means that whatever their own pet beliefs are, are more important than human relationships, and I don't feel that way, and this was the big conflict around testifying, that I didn't want to hurt people regardless of how they felt about me now or how they looked upon me. I still related to them when I knew them as human beings, and I liked them, and those I didn't like I didn't like. This is why your preliminary remarks in most of my talks with your investigator made it possible for me to feel that there wasn't any reason not to testify because this was going to be used not in a retaliatory or destructive means but as a constructive means for essentially national protection and, in the long run, protection of the very people I may be talking about.

I hope I have answered a few of your questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

If there is anything else that you want to say in regard to your leaving the Communist Party, you are perfectly free to say it, but it seems to me that you have covered the subject very fully, I think.

Mr. HADDOCK. I think I have covered it pretty well, my Communist experience, which is in the past.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think now that will be all.

(Whereupon, at 4:52 p. m. the hearing was adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Part 2

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1954

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.
EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 11:20 a. m., in room 225, Old House Office Building, the Honorable Donald L. Jackson (acting chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript), and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; Dolores Anderson, reporter.

Mr. JACKSON. Will you raise your right hand to be sworn, please?

In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. BURKE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF FRANCES BURKE

Mr. JACKSON. Let the record show that the chairman has appointed a subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Scherer, Doyle, and Jackson, with Jackson as acting chairman, for the purpose of taking this testimony.

Proceed please, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name please?

Mrs. BURKE. Frances Burke, B-u-r-k-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mrs. BURKE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the practice of the committee to advise all witnesses that they are entitled to have counsel present with them, if they desire, and that they have the right to consult counsel at all times. Do you desire counsel?

Mrs. BURKE. Well, I didn't know what I was called for or what it was all about, or anything, when I came.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a matter that is up to you, as to whether you desire to have counsel with you or not.

Mr. SCHERER. Perhaps after she listens to some of your questions, if she then decides she wants counsel, of course she can do so.

¹ Released by the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Tell the Chair so, if at any time during the course of the interrogation it is your desire to suspend for the purpose of getting counsel. Please don't hesitate to so state.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been known by any name, other than your present name?

Mrs. BURKE. I am afraid I will have to decline to answer questions on the ground it might tend to incriminate me. I don't know what it is going to lead to and possibly what it could lead to, and I am afraid of that. If that comes under the ground of wanting to have counsel, I presume I would like to know—if such questions would—if I answer such questions if it would lead to having to answer questions which would tend to incriminate me.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Counsel, I believe under the circumstances, the indecision of the witness relative to the questions, that it is probably the best thing to do to extend the subpoena to a date when it will be possible for the witness to be back with counsel.

What is your feeling regarding this, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. You were subpoenaed to be here this morning?

Mrs. BURKE. To be here April 2.

Mr. DOYLE. And then given notice to come today?

Mrs. BURKE. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. And your subpoena showed you were to appear before this House Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mrs. BURKE. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Now you have had time to get legal counsel, haven't you? An opportunity?

Mrs. BURKE. This is entirely new to me—I don't know the processes of the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. You had no idea what you were going to be asked?

Mrs. BURKE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you consulted with a lawyer since being subpoenaed?

Mrs. BURKE. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you are right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. The subpoena will be continued. I would very much like to have this witness this week before the subcommittee leaves.

(At this point Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room.)

Mr. JACKSON. Because of your indecision or your lack of knowledge, I will state that the committee is in possession of testimony and information which relates to alleged activities on your part in the Communist Party. The committee has two alternatives—two courses of action. In this instance, first, we can proceed to question you on those alleged activities to elicit what information you will be able to give the committee, which will help it in its investigations. Secondly, the committee will give you time to consult with counsel if you desire.

The choice is entirely up to you, as to what you want to do. Now, knowing the purpose of your being here, what do you desire to do?

Mrs. BURKE. May I ask a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly.

Mrs. BURKE. Is it permissible to have counsel present at the time of the questioning?

Mr. JACKSON. Oh, yes. You may have counsel at your side during the entire interrogation. He can advise you on matters of constitutional rights and other matters where a counsel is helpful.

Mrs. BURKE. Well, then, I think I would prefer to have counsel present.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Where do you live?

Mrs. BURKE. New York City.

Mr. SCHERER. What is your occupation now?

Mrs. BURKE. I am an office worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is why I made the suggestion to her that possibly she could consult counsel today and in that way she would not lose another day from work in coming back here. But that is a matter entirely of her own decision as to whether she desires to consult counsel here or someone she already knows in New York City or some other place.

Mrs. BURKE. Well, I certainly know no one here.

Mr. WALTER. It isn't absolutely essential that you have counsel. You are not charged with anything—our questions are the usual questions. Why don't you see how far you can get—

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; we could start. There is an uncertainty in the witness' mind as to whether she should answer questions, however, in line with my previous statement, we cannot proceed in the absence of counsel. I would like to get this matter out of the way definitely. I think it is very important for us to do it before the subcommittee leaves for the coast, as the witness is called in relation to the San Diego hearings.

Mr. WALTER. This witness?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about Wednesday?

Mr. JACKSON. Wednesday is fine, as far as I am concerned, and the subpoena will be continued until 10:30 a. m., Wednesday morning, which will give you an opportunity, Mrs. Burke, to consult with a counsel of your own choice and be represented.

For the time being you are excused, Mrs. Burke, and directed to return to this committee room at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, April 14, 1954.

Mrs. BURKE. Yes, sir; thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a. m., the executive hearing was adjourned.)



INDEX TO PART 2

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Ackerstein, Lynn	4608
Adams, Richard	4611
Aderer, Clair	4581
Alexander, Paul (<i>see also</i> Alexander, Sterling Campbell)	4568, 4582, 4590
Alexander, Sterling Campbell (<i>see also</i> Alexander, Paul)	4582
Anguis, Robert	4583
Arabian, Mary	4610
Badger, Arthur	4583
Baker, Enos, Jr	4612
Barnes, Carroll	4579
Barroway, Leo	4593
Bennett, Jack	4610
Bensinger, Otto	4582
Bernhart, Sol	4584
Berquist, Julia (Whitehead)	4581
Berquist, Ray (Whitehead)	4581
Beyrer, Forest	4583
Black, Eddie	4579
Black, Elaine (Mrs. Eddie Black; Mrs. Karl Hama)	4579
Boehm, Jeff	4608, 4611
Bollman	4582
Bowman	4582
Bradley, William H	4579, 4583
Breedon, Wilmer	4581
Bridges, Harry	4581
Bristow	4601
Browder, Earl	4600
Buchanan, David	4611
Buchanan, Lucia (Mrs. David Buchanan)	4611
Bunyard, Lolita (<i>see also</i> Gibson, Lolita)	4597
Burke, Ed	4569, 4571
Burke, Frances (<i>see also</i> Decker, Frances)	(testimony) 4619-4621
Carlson, Evans	4606
Carron, Ben	4581
Chambers, Pat	4566, 4567, 4572, 4584
Ching, Peter	4601
Conway, William	4611, 4612
Conway, Mrs. William	4611
Crummins, Murray	4598, 4599
Cutler, Emma	4568
Darcy, Sam	4579, 4580
Decker, Dr.	4570, 4571, 4583
Decker, Caroline	4566, 4567, 4570, 4572
Decker, Frances	4583
Delgado, Mike	4581
Dugdale, Mr	4611
Dugdale, Mrs.	4611
Edwards, Carmen	4582
Eisenstadt, Mollie	4616
Fairclough, Frederick	4601
Foster, William Z	4584
Fuller, Bob	4581
Gallagher, Leo	4586, 4587

	Page
Gannett, Betty	4579, 4586
Garretson, Jimmy	4585
Garrigues, Charles H. (Brick)	4577
Garrison, Peter J.	4579
Garrison, Ruth (Mrs. Peter J. Garrison)	4579
George, Harrison	4585
Gibson, Lolita (<i>see also</i> Bunyard, Lolita)	4597, 4605, 4611
Gitlow, Benjamin	4584
Gould, Robert	4598
Gregovich, Lee	4582, 4590, 4609
Griffin, Nathaniel	4572
Guinier, Ewart	4599
Guterrez, Miguel, Jr.	4569
Guterrez, Miguel, Sr.	4569
Haddock, Benjamin Holmes	(testimony) 4595-4619
Hall, Jack	4599, 4601, 4602
Hama, Karl	4578, 4579
Hamlin, Lloyd	4603, 4605-4608, 4612, 4613, 4617, 4618
Hancock, Stanley B.	(testimony) 4564-4592
Hanoff, Elmer (Efim) (Efim)	4568, 4574
Herman, Nathan	4609
Herman, Millie (Mrs. Nathan Herman)	4609
Hines, Captain	4569
Hollingshead, Ed	4582
Hunnewell, Carroll	4581, 4582, 4587
Hunnewell, Margaret (Mrs. Carroll Hunnewell)	4582
Hunt, Harry	4612
Hunt, Lillian (Mrs. Harry Hunt)	4609, 4612, 4613
Hyun, Alice	4600
Jasmagy, Clarence	4581
Jerome, V. J.	4591
Jones, Claude L.	4579, 4582
Kahn, Elinor	4600
Kantor, Solomon	4597
Keckler, Bessie A. (Mrs. LeRoy Keckler)	4579, 4582
Keckler, LeRoy	4582
Kerrigan, Margaret (Margie) (Mrs. Tony Kerrigan)	4582
Kerrigan, Tony	4582
Kimote	4600
Korenorio	4606
Kyle, Lacey	4579
Lambert, Rudy	4586
Lambert, Walter	4586
Langer, Joe	4583
Leech, Bert	4582
Lee, Margaret	4615
Lerner, Ray	4615, 4616
Livingston, David	4599
Lohr, George	4603, 4611-4613
Lovestone, Jay	4584
Lydick, John	4577, 4582
Lym, Frances	4582
Lym, LaVerne	4582
Maldonado	4567, 4568
McDermott, Beatrice (Mrs. James McDermott)	4582
McDermott, James	4582
McElrath	4600
McKinnon, Clifford	4611
Mitchell	4601
Mitchnick, Martin	4598, 4599, 4600
Morkowski, Ray	4608
Nelson, Steve	4569, 4570, 4571
Nemi, Mrs.	4616
Nemiso, Jesse	4614, 4615
Newsome, Cosby	4582, 4609
Newsome, Mrs. Cosby	4582, 4609

	Page
O'Connor, Oleta (<i>see also</i> Yates, Oleta O'Connor)	4579, 4586, 4587
Olivas, Juan	4569
Pellman, Matt	4579
Perry, Pettis	4579
Ray, Dorothy	4567, 4568
Reich, William (Bill)	4603, 4604, 4609, 4612
Reinecke, Dr.	4599
Richardson, Esco L.	4583
Richmond, Al	4584, 4585
Roe, Mrs. Grover	4582
Rogers, A. C.	4577, 4582, 4607, 4608, 4613
Rosenfield, Nancy	4612, 4614
Ryan, Adrian	4582
Salorcino, Anthony	4576
Saunders, Dave	4579, 4587
Saunders, F. L.	4579
Schmidt, Henry	4587
Schneiderman, William	4579, 4580, 4586
Schumacher, John	4587
Seldes, George	4597
Shermis, Cecelia (Mrs. Harry Shermis)	4612
Shermis, Harry	4612
Smolen, Morrie	4584
Steinmetz, Harry L.	4566, 4606
Still, Everett O.	4579, 4580
Taylor, Dan	4583
Thibault, Frank	4583
Tito	4616
Toback, James E.	4583, 4604, 4613
Tormey, James	4580
Tosney, Mike	4583
Volmer, Rose	4583
Vossbrink, Ralph	4602, 4617
Wahlenmaier, Clarence	4582
Wahlenmaier, Vernon	4582
Watrous, Bob	4610
Weatherwax, John	4580
White, Robert	4583
Whitehead, Julia	4581
Whitehead, Ray	4581
Williams, John	4584
Wilson, Bertha	4584
Winston, Pauline	4582
Worcester, Daisy Lee	4583
Wosk, David	4583
Yates	4587
Yates, Oleta O'Connor (<i>see also</i> O'Connor, Oleta)	4579

ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of Labor	4566, 4569, 4573, 4574
American Legion	4598, 4605
American Newspaper Guild	4584
American Veterans' Committee	4604-4607
Cannery and Agriculture Workers Industrial Union	4591
Central Labor Council, AFL, San Diego, Calif.	4565, 4566, 4569, 4578, 4582
Cleaners and Dyers Union, San Diego	4587
Columbia University	4596, 4613, 4614, 4616
Columbia University, New York School of Social Work	4596, 4614
Communist International	4584
Communist Party, East San Diego Branch	4602, 4609, 4610, 4611
Communist Party, La Jolla Club (California)	4610
Communist Party, Los Angeles	4569
Communist Party, Mexico	4572
Communist Party, National City Club (California)	4610
Communist Party, Poliflabor Committee, California	4569

	Page
Communist Party, San Diego.....	4577
Communist Party, San Francisco.....	4579
Community Chest.....	4597
Congress of Industrial Organizations.....	4566, 4573, 4574, 4581 4586, 4607-4609
Congress of Industrial Organizations, Political Action Committee.....	4607, 4608
Cooks and Waitresses' Union, CIO.....	4609
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	4569
Florence School, San Diego.....	4596
Friends of the Soviet Union.....	4590
International Association of Machinists.....	4574
International Labor Defense.....	4579
International Longshoremen's Association.....	4581
International Typographical Union.....	4583
Lenin Institute, Moscow.....	4590
London Missionary Society.....	4606
Longshoremen's Union.....	4600
Mental Hygiene Clinic of Union County, Plainfield, N. J.....	4597
National Negro Congress.....	4605
Office of Naval Intelligence.....	4612
Office of Price Administration.....	4603
People's Bookstore, San Diego.....	4582
PolitiLabor Committee, California.....	4569
Progressive Party.....	4605, 4607
Red International of Labor Unions.....	4566
San Diego Board of Education.....	4588
Spanish Refugee Appeal.....	4606
Student Social Service Employees' Union.....	4614, 4615
Unemployed Council.....	4587
United Auto Workers.....	4573
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America, CIO.....	4566, 4586
United Jewish Appeal.....	4596
United States Army.....	4597
University of Hawaii.....	4599
Veterans of Foreign Wars.....	4598, 4605
Works Progress Administration.....	4583
World Congress of Communist Parties in Moscow, 1935.....	4580
Young Communist League, California.....	4567, 4568, 4581-4583
Young Communist League, Los Angeles.....	4579
Young Men's Christian Association.....	4598

PUBLICATIONS

Daily People's World.....	4569-4571, 4579, 4584-4586, 4591-4593, 4604, 4610, 4612
El Machete.....	4572
Hoy.....	4572
Obrera, Lucha.....	4572
San Diego Sun.....	4586
Santa Cruz Sentinel News.....	4593
Trade Union News.....	4581, 4583
Western Worker.....	4584, 4586, 4587, 4892

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3020

